

The CLERGY REVIEW

NEW SERIES VOL. XLII NO. II NOVEMBER 1957

PAROCHIAL MISSIONS

FROM time to time discussions arise, either in conversation or in print, concerning different aspects of missions to Catholics; occasionally they call into question even their basic utility. It is not the purpose of this article to kindle controversy, nor to set forth an exhaustive treatise upon the whole subject. It is the object of the writer to give a simple straightforward reply to the more common and not unkindly criticisms which a missionary is apt to hear.

I. As to the basic utility of missions little need be said. The Holy See has repeatedly stressed their importance, granting generous indulgences in the endeavour to promote their frequency. Similarly can. 1349 prescribes a mission for each parish at least once in every ten years.

The Holy Spirit has produced in the Church special Religious Institutes for this purpose; such labours are also fostered by Diocesan Societies, and by Orders and Religious Congregations whose scope is more varied. The stream of vocations for this apostolate remains strong.

Finally, general experience proves the value of rightly conducted missions.

II. Criticism is sometimes based on a misunderstanding of what a mission is.

A mission is meant to benefit all souls, whether good, indifferent or bad. It is not a retreat for the more pious; nor a luxury for a chosen few whose spiritual refinement is receptive of highly elevated subject matter. For such folk special retreats can be organized. A mission is designed to confirm the good: to stir up the indifferent: to reclaim the bad.

In spite of the zeal of apostolic clergy, the ordinary means of grace do not meet with complete success against the world, the flesh and the devil. This is not the fault of the clergy, still less is it the fault of the means of grace. But a mission is an extraordinary means of grace, which does meet with considerable extra success—even if not always spectacular, or immediately

apparent. It is a powerful periodical aid to the efforts of toiling pastors, as subsequent remarks will demonstrate.

III. It has been stated above that experience confirms the value of "rightly conducted" missions. This phrase needs some development.

Under normal conditions, a mission is a specialized work requiring specialists to conduct it. Of course a zealous priest can preach a number of sermons within a limited period, bearing fruit with that blessing of God which rests on all apostolic labour. But that is not the point. A missionary should be specially trained for his work; his preaching, confessional practice and visiting all involve careful organizing upon lines tested by the long experience of his trainers. This in turn has to be consolidated by his own personal experience. Naturally he must gain this, but as second or third assistant to an "older hand". Much disappointment is due to the employment of unqualified missionaries, who may indeed be members of a Mission Institute but who are not yet capable of the task.

Again, the grace proper to such a vocation is a factor to be recognized; but also again, this grace, together with technical qualification, will not of itself suffice. Unless the missionary himself is striving to be a true man of God and a mortified man of prayer, he will tend to become mere "sounding brass", from whose labours little solid or lasting gain can be expected.

But a rightly conducted mission has other features. There is, for instance, the previous preparation of the parish, a process which includes two special points:

(a) *Choice of time.* The best time of the year according to local conditions should be selected, with a suitable interval between missions. Thus, comparatively few parishes can stand an annual mission, which would quickly lose much of its character. Similarly a mission is not merely a way of coping with Easter duties. Perhaps for most parishes a three-year interval has proved the most satisfactory—with "renewals" if desirable, as explained below. Young people who have left school during these periods are thus particularly benefited.

(b) *Previous advertisement,* remote and proximate. Remotely, the parish should be told some months beforehand about the projected mission. All, especially Convents and sodalities, should

be urged to pray regularly for its success. Parochial helpers, Legionaries, Collectors, as well as the local Clergy, should combine in "softening up" the ground well in advance.

Proximately, at least a fortnight before the mission opens, handbills should be distributed to every household. These again should be of large size, not flimsy strips; people are far more impressed with the former, well printed, especially if more than one colour is used. To add to this, placards are a great help, not only near the church, but also at a few chosen spots in the district. The local paper will as a rule print a notice. School children make excellent advertising agents in their own homes.

If such preparation be made, the mission will start off in full swing; otherwise the first week will be wasted in telling people what is happening, whilst many will miss the early part of it, especially if they have already made engagements for the coming weeks, which would not have been made had they known in time.

In this connexion another point may be mentioned. In order that all may be properly visited and given opportunity for confession, and that a complete scheme of matter may be adequately dealt with, it is important that a sufficient number of missionaries be engaged for a sufficient length of time. If at all possible it is advisable to have a separate children's mission shortly before that of the adults. Under modern conditions, the two are often concurrent, which is better than leaving out the children altogether. But mission-time is exacting for all, especially the missionaries, for whom the event is not just an occasional strain; they are generally at their work for most of the year, sometimes going directly from one to another. If too much is required from too few in too short a time there is bound to be some disappointment. For ordinary parishes, even small country ones, a fortnight is necessary for these purposes; one week is not long enough to cope with them; especially as the choice then arises between omitting matter essential in present days, or so congesting sermons that they cannot be assimilated properly by the people. For really big parishes three weeks should be regarded as the norm if anything adequate is to be effected. In paragraph V below certain points will demonstrate this argument more fully.

Again in this connexion one may touch on a delicate question. A missionary does not expect luxurious entertainment. Clergy are wonderfully generous and usually cater handsomely for the visitor's comfort. But the latter is quite accustomed to "roughing it"; and so the poverty of a parish should never be a bar to this work for souls, nor an embarrassment to the hard-pressed parish priest. Many a mission is given without stipend; for though the workman is worthy of his hire, and diocesan custom or regulations often govern these matters, the money question cannot be allowed to interfere with this apostolate.

IV. The chief benefits of a mission may now be briefly indicated.

(i) There is concentrated, continuous, connected instruction upon the great truths of Faith and means of salvation. Large numbers of the faithful receive little instruction, with consequent detriment to faith and morals. Some causes of this are: the missing of Mass—absence on Sunday evenings—and the fact that many go to an early Mass, perhaps to Holy Communion, but do not return later for a sermon. The concentrated instructions given in an average fortnight's mission could otherwise only be spread over the Sundays of six months, during which time the intervals tend to dissipate their force, whilst those who need them most are absent.

(ii) Certain subjects are dealt with thoroughly which cannot be suitably so treated at other times by the people's own clergy, for various obvious reasons.

(iii) The love of the faithful for missions, and the attention they give to a specialized presentation of matter, combine to produce unusual effects.

(iv) The mission is a period of extraordinary grace, during which (apart from spectacular results) there is indubitable "sowing", with effects that follow perhaps much later. There is also the very real work of preventing the lapse of many, strengthening the good, making the tepid more fervent.

In any case, much of the long, patient hard labour of the pastor is brought to rapid fruition by the "hot-house" influence of the mission. The missionary reaps much of the pastor's sowing: he sows much that the pastor will reap: there is alternate planting and watering, God giving the increase.

(v) The mission confessional yields an immense harvest of invaluable, if hidden, fruit. With this object in view the Church grants special faculties to missionaries, whether by law or by privileges.

(vi) Over and above what can be visualized, missions lay a number of "time fuses"; prompt visible results cannot form a criterion. The "punch" of the mission goes on through the parish long after the close, leading to issues none the less happy for being delayed. Sometimes reclaimed folk bring back others as months pass by.

(vii) In all ways a vast amount of evil is prevented, which alone is of incalculable benefit.

(viii) Remarkable answers from Divine Providence often follow the corporate prayers of the bulk of the parish; including e.g. a novena of Communions for parochial intentions such as schools, church building, etc. Usually the whole congregation pray publicly each evening for the conversion of local sinners.

(ix) Many a convert has been started upon his "path to Rome" at a mission, even if he does not put himself under instruction at once. Vocations also have frequently been God's gifts to those who have attended a mission with fervour.

V. There are two queries not uncommonly put to missionaries by priests who are anxious for the good of their flocks:

(a) Why do missions prove less successful today than they did a number of years ago?

(b) How can one reconcile a "successful" mission with later relapses—especially that kind of "mission Catholic" who will not be seen again until the next mission? (The ordinary "recidive" is not here considered, but the one who falls away from the practice of his Faith.)

These questions are absolutely fair and very much to the point, involving considerations important for both pastors and missionaries.

Question (a). As shown above, missions today do have considerable success, probably as great as ever in the past, even if not always spectacular. If this question concerns chiefly such visible effects as many notable conversions, or a more widespread fervour, several reasons can be adduced. For instance,

in diebus illis (apart from the glamour of the past) a mission was more of a rarity than nowadays. Thus today, when a mission is the first for say forty years, or perhaps the very first, all the ancient reactions are reproduced. Again, today one often finds that an area formerly served by one church is being served by many. The consequence is that results are divided amongst a number of missions. In one sense, the land may be said to be better watered, less thirsty. In a different sense the opposite can obtain, in that the modern destruction of home life, together with more numerous occasions of sin, render the soil itself less fruitful. Also, new housing estates receive crowds of Catholics of all kinds, uprooted from previous conditions where a parochial family spirit prevailed; thus separated and strangers to each other, their "swing" of mission custom is lost. People are far more dependent upon circumstances than is sometimes realized; but if the old "street opinion", or its equivalent, has passed, all the previous kind of family spirit should in time be regained—an end towards which missions contribute immensely. Again, the increase of shift-work keeps many away from regular attendance; whilst of course in any case parents often have to take turns on account of young children.

Another cause sometimes is that previously more missionaries were employed for a longer period. Naturally, existing conditions not infrequently necessitate this change, but results will certainly be affected.

The comparative drop in the number of converts to the Faith may be accounted for by the fact that non-Catholics of today are in general far more indifferent than before. The average Protestant used to be religious-minded; he was grounded in such rudiments of Christian belief as the Incarnation and Redemption: the need of prayer and Divine worship: the duty of fleeing from the wrath to come. When he attended the course of mission instructions and sermons, the claims of the Faith were readily admitted—unless bigotry prevailed.

We do not believe that results are on the whole less satisfactory than of yore, though their nature may be less striking to the eye. Yet even were the charge true, results remain continuously good; were missions to be abandoned much loss would soon be apparent. Of course no single mission can achieve all possible

good; with the greatest reverence we have to admit that our Lord himself did not meet with that success; hence the need of repeated missions, say every three years.

Another point must be remembered also. The "Welfare State", besides causing the spread of materialism, is sapping much sense of responsibility from our people. Everything is "laid on"; and with TV and other amenities dependant only on, so to speak, pressing a button, the careless Catholic wants the Church laid on too. Surely, if numbers fall away, there is all the more need for missions than to abandon them in favour of dealing only with the devout. Certainly adaptation to present conditions is necessary; of which more will be said below.

Question (b). Later relapses are indeed a recurring sorrow. But on the other hand many conversions prove to be permanent, which would not have been effected except for the mission. Some of the reclaimed die soon after. Why deny the chance of reclamation to all because some abuse it? In any case a whole mission is worth while for one single soul. But not every such relapse means that that person has abused his chance. Let us look at some of these cases. The lapsed had, at least for a time, good dispositions; their past sins were forgiven; this alone will facilitate their ultimately dying in grace. The fact that they returned at all is a fruit of the mission; their relapse is not the fault of the mission. However, it must be remembered that such conversions often need much sympathetic after care and help. Many a converted "hard case" has to face a long period of ridicule and annoyance without support. He is weak (who is not?); he needs a prop; his previous occasions of sin may be difficult to avoid even with the best will in the world; and a fall tends to take the heart out of him completely. After all, if we priests, with our protected and well-nourished spiritual lives, find that our own retreat resolutions have sometimes to be restored, surely the lot of the poor exposed relapsed soul should meet with tolerant understanding.

Assuredly not every relapsed case is thus conditioned. Hence the "mission Catholic"—i.e. the one who does not intend to be seen again until the next mission. If the missionary cannot dispose him to any real purpose of amendment then such a person is not fit for absolution. However, experience can point to true

conversions even amongst branded "mission Catholics"—who also sometimes in the mercy of God die suddenly afterwards.

VI. This brings us to consider "Renewals". On the whole these are less needed today than formerly, but are not therefore to be entirely discounted. In order to consolidate the work of the mission, to strengthen the waning fervour of the reclaimed, it may sometimes be desirable that one or two of the missionaries should return for a shorter period about six months after the mission.

One advantage of a renewal is that it allows of a good deal more latitude and elasticity than the mission in respect of pulpit matter; especially if the preceding mission had not been long enough to include all desirable subjects. This may serve also to answer the charge of "rigidity" sometimes made against missions; and to introduce the question of adaptation.

VII. *Adaptation*. It is true that plans can be too rigidly moulded upon schemes found best half a century ago. Adaptation to times and places, including particular local needs, must be rightly arranged. Since, however, a mission has a specific object to attain, since it deals with the constant unchanging character of fallen human nature, sin, the world, the devil; the means of grace, salvation, the Passion, God's love and mercy, Holy Eucharist, the power and necessity of our Lady's perpetual succour, Heaven—and the *alternatives* to mercy and Heaven—this adaptation cannot be at the expense of what is necessary for the object to be attained, nor of factors permanently requisite for salvation. Accidental changes therefore may be beneficial whereas substantial change would destroy the work. Here it is *ad rem* to quote two passages from admonitions given by our present Holy Father Pius XII:

(i) Concerning the Eternal Truths: address to Lenten preachers in Rome: March 1949.

We dare not lose time in combating with all the power at our command this sliding away of our people into irreligion and in arousing within them the spirit of prayer and penance. The preaching of the elementary truths of our Faith and of the last end of Man has lost nothing of its importance in these days; nay more, it has become indeed more pressing and urgent. This applies no less to the preaching on Hell. We must indeed treat of this subject with dignity and wisdom. But as regards the truth

itself in its substance, there is a sacred obligation before God and before men, to proclaim it and explain it without any weakening, just as Christ himself revealed it. No changing conditions of time can take away from the force of this obligation. The conscience of every priest, be he in the ordinary or in the extraordinary ministry is burdened with this, being appointed to the office of teaching, admonishing and guiding the Faithful. It is true that the desire for heaven is a higher motive than fear of Eternal Suffering, but this does not imply that it is a more efficacious motive either in preserving man from sin or in bringing them back to God.

(ii) "Mediator Dei": sec. 35.:

... to impel us to lead a more perfect life we need meditation on heavenly things, and we need spiritual exercises . . . there must be a knowledge of the facts and reasons upon which the obligation of religion is based . . . and because motives of love do not always appeal to the soul, which is sometimes under the stress of evil desires, it is also most opportune that we should be moved to salutary compunction by the consideration of the Divine Justice, and so be brought to a sense of Christian humility, and to repentance and amendment.

Certainly the days are gone when, in some sermons, mere noisy assertion and lurid detail were the most practical means of attaining their object. Though vigour, forceful presentation, vehemence, are always essential to mission preaching, the mentality of people today requires plenty of emphatic but clearly reasoned argument; driven home if need be by due pungency proportioned to circumstances.

Excellent examples of adaptation were found in the many exceedingly fruitful missions given during the last war. In spite of "black out", conscription, air-raid damage, altered shifts in mines and factories, even when sirens were apt to sound at any moment—in fact in spite of conditions at first sight deemed to be impossible—the work was found to be practical, with accidental changes according to circumstances.

Thus far doubtless the majority of experienced missionaries are in agreement about the main features, or substance, of this article; differing possibly in accidentals. But the writer has a

more personal conviction, shared with many parish priests and missionaries, concerning adaptation to specific conditions prevailing in some localities; a matter well worth careful reflexion.

Without doubt, the church itself is the proper place for all that a mission involves; with its pulpit, confessionals, altar rails, sanctuary, altar, and the presence of our Lord in the Tabernacle. But visiting does not bring everyone to the church, whilst the mission should bring its message to as many as possible. In industrial towns especially, there are low quarters whence people do not flock to the church, often enough thickly populated by Catholics who are more interested in the companionship of local public houses, and lodging houses. Without any prejudice to the use of the church, there is a case for erecting an outside platform, or equivalent, on some nights at least, in these spots; where strictly mission sermons can be preached concurrently with the main operations in the church, aided, if necessary, by loud-speakers in order to penetrate upper windows and bar-parlours. There would be little likelihood of serious interference or violence; but even should such occurrences take place, no missionary would hesitate to risk some injury in pursuit of his apostolate. The writer has had some experience of public preaching of a similar sort; and has been struck by the politeness and reverence of the crowd. Confessions of men have also been heard behind the platform on these occasions.

VIII. In conclusion it may be said that everything in this article does not apply collectively to every aspect of every mission. Nor is it pretended that missionaries are supermen, free from faults, unable to make mistakes, able to banish all sin from the world. But as a summary of main features often discussed with genuine and healthy criticism, it is hoped that the mutual desire of pastors and missionaries for the good of souls may be the more effectively translated into operation. Both combine according to the grace and duties proper to their state in the vineyard of the Lord, who alone can give the increase. "Neither he that planteth is anything, nor he that watereth, but God that giveth the increase. Now he that planteth and he that watereth are one" (I Cor. iii, 7, 8). "That both he that soweth and he that reapeth may rejoice together" (John iv, 36).

J. PARGITER, C.S.S.R.

A MARTYR MANQUÉ

THE EARLY LIFE OF ANTHONY TYRRELL

"A MAN that hath done much good." That was how Blessed Robert Southwell described Anthony Tyrrell when he was captured by the priest-hunters in July 1586. Once in prison, Tyrrell proceeded to do a great deal of harm: and it is the evil that he did which has lived after him. This article is an attempt to disinter some of the good. It is based mainly on letters which Tyrrell wrote to his friends in Rome during the first years of his priesthood, and which are now preserved (in contemporary copies) in the Roman archives of the Society of Jesus. Tyrrell had a flair for writing, and as recusant documents his letters are no less interesting than those of more admirable men.

After a youth of penurious exile in Flanders, a begging-tour of his relations in England, and a term of imprisonment for religion, Anthony Tyrrell became a student of the newly founded English College at Rome in the spring of 1578.¹ On St George's Day, 1579, he was one of the first group of students to take the College oath which bound one to serve on the English Mission. His name appears on the College register amid a roll of heroes and cowards, martyrs and renegades: and he himself had some of the characteristics of both classes. Intelligent, witty, somewhat sensual, rather conceited, genuinely religious, at bottom selfish, braver than many men and more reckless than most, he would have been, in normal times, a popular fellow among his friends and unnoticed in the world at large. But he became a priest at a time when a priest must be a hero. And no one could ever have thought him a hero.

After two and a half years at the English College, he was sent to England as a priest in September 1580, in company with George Birkhead (who later became Archpriest), Edward Grately (who later became a tool of the Government), and John Gower (who later went mad). The party stopped a fortnight at Rheims, and then crossed to England (without Gower)

¹ The date of his arrival in Rome is settled by a statement of his that he arrived just before John Nichols, who was in Rome by April 1578 (Roman Archives S.J. Anglia 30, 157f.).

at the end of October. On 17 November they were in London, where Fr Persons met them and provided them with all they needed. They then split up, and Tyrrell began his missionary activities.

On the 29 April 1581, after six months' successful work, he returned to London to attend to some business matters and to consult with some of his friends. As he was going into a tailor's house, he was seen by a former fellow-student at the English College, John Nichols. Once a Protestant minister, Nichols had abjured his heresy before the Inquisition in Rome; but he had left the English College without taking orders. On his return to England, he had been put in the Tower, where he had recanted. He had since been occupied preaching and publishing propaganda sermons against the Catholic Church.

When Tyrrell came out of the tailor's, he found Nichols waiting for him. Knowing his reputation, he did not reply to his greeting; but Nichols caught him as he tried to step past, and shouted "Here's a traitor, a Papist, a priest: arrest him, arrest him!" A crowd gathered and asked who Tyrrell was.

"A renegade," replied Nichols, "trained up at Rome in the seminary there—a sworn enemy to the Queen and all of us. If you don't believe me, let me tell you that I am John Nichols, the man who publicly forswore the Romish religion in the Tower of London." He urged that Tyrrell should be taken to the Tower, but some of the crowd insisted that the district was under the jurisdiction of the Dean of Westminster, so to Westminster they went.

Half way there, Tyrrell saw a chance to escape. He took to his heels and ran, with a large crowd behind him shouting "Stop, traitor!" Most of the passers-by left room for him to escape, and the few who tried to hold him he was able to push aside. But he ran into a cul-de-sac, and was recaptured. They dragged him through the streets roughly, now, and the crowd grew bigger than ever. Tyrrell tried to address them. "Friends," he said, "I am neither a criminal nor a traitor; but because I am a Catholic they will not leave me alone." He shouted this all the way down the street, until they took him into a house and made a bargain with him that they would take him gently if he would only keep quiet.

On arrival at Westminster they found that the Dean was still having dinner. As Nichols had not yet eaten ("like the Jews who swore not to taste food until they had killed Paul", remarked Tyrrell), everyone went into a nearby inn. While Nichols was dining, Tyrrell (according to his own account) delivered a speech of six hundred and fifty words without being interrupted once. He said that he bore his captor no grudge for what had happened today, but that he could not forget the libels which he had published in his anti-Catholic pamphlet.

"You said," he told Nichols, "that when you first arrived in Rome you made a speech before the Pope and numerous Cardinals, and that they made you a most complimentary vote of thanks. Aren't you ashamed to tell such impudent lies? Every one of us who was living in Rome at the time knows that your story is untrue—and in any case, your own base birth and rough speech proves you a liar. Further, you said that on the feast of St Peter's Chains, in the English College, you made a Latin speech before the Pope's chaplains and the English Doctors, in which you so lauded good works, that you left no room for Faith.¹ What a wicked lie! If you had said anything against Faith or against our Christian religion, you would have been stopped by the Jesuits and shouted down by your fellow-students. Nothing could be more foolish than to say that you preached before the Papal chaplains, because they know no Latin, being skilled only in music; and we had our servants eating with us at the time, as well."

And so he went on, answering Nichols' statements point by point. And the end of it all, Nichols made no answer except a flat denial. The two of them started to wrangle, until one of those at table turned to Tyrrell. "I don't know either of you," he said, "but if I am any judge of a man's face and speech, I would rather believe you than this fellow Nichols." Then he turned to Nichols and said, "Watch out that nobody catches you at Rome, or they will make things equally unpleasant for you there."

"I am safe enough," said Nichols, "I will never go back to

¹ The "capellani Pontificii" were the singers in the Papal Choir; the "English Doctors", the elderly scholars who used to live in the English Hospice before it was converted into a college.

Rome: they think there that I am damned. They believe that nobody can be saved once he has denied the Pope, not even if he repents."

Tyrrell, however, proved to everybody's satisfaction that, even though Nichols would certainly be put in death if he returned to Rome, he had no need to despair of salvation. Nichols' only reply was to drink to Tyrrell's health.

Then they went into the Dean's house, and found him sitting at table surrounded by his servants. The Dean was a Welshman, Gabriel Goodman, now about fifty years old; he had been chaplain to Sir William Cecil, and still held many other preferments; but nothing ever came of the many schemes to promote him to a bishopric. Nichols announced his business, and Dean Goodman asked Tyrrell if he was a priest.

"I am," said Tyrrell.

"Then how is it that you are wearing lay clothes?"

"To avoid falling into the hands of my enemies."

The Dean dismissed the servants, allowing only Nichols to remain as his secretary. Then he asked Tyrrell when he had left England, when he had returned, where he had stayed, whom he had met, how often he had said Mass, and so on. Tyrrell refused to answer except to a definite charge. No definite charge was made, but after a few insulting remarks the Dean turned to theology. He recalled his servants to listen to the discussion.

First of all, he asked where there was any mention of the Mass in the whole of the Bible. "It depends," said Tyrrell, "what you mean by the Mass." "Your sacrifice," said the Dean, "in which you try to kill Christ every day, tearing him to pieces with your teeth."

"As you say," replied the priest, "it is a sacrifice, but it isn't true to say that we try to kill Christ or that we tear him with our teeth. Since you admit that it is a sacrifice, I can answer your question easily. The never-ending sacrifice (that is what Daniel calls it) was first of all foreshadowed, then prophesied, then promised, then given, and last of all offered. If you have ever read the Scriptures, you can find it on every page."

"I read the Scriptures," said the Dean, "and I understand them, too. But I cannot find any mention of your daily sacrifice.

On the contrary, St Paul says that Christ suffered only once, and by his single oblation made satisfaction to the Father for the whole human race. You contradict him flatly, multiplying sacrifices the way you do."

"You say that you have read and understood the scriptures," answered Tyrrell. "It does not sound like it from your words. Daniel, Malachy, and all the other prophets foretold our daily sacrifice. It is useless to quote St Paul against us, because when he speaks of a single offering, he is referring to the bloody sacrifice which was prefigured by the yearly slaying of the Paschal Lamb; the sacrifice in which Christ is a priest according to the order of Aaron. But we mean the sacrifice without blood, in which Christ is a priest for ever according to the order of Melchisedech, who was the type of our sacrifice. We do not kill Christ (for the lamb was slain only once) but we offer Him, and we eat Him, just as he told us to, when he said "Take ye and eat, this is my Body," and "Do this for a commemoration of me."

"How do you think that those words of Christ prove that the Mass is a sacrifice?" asked the Dean.

"Because He says 'Do this for a commemoration of me'."

The Dean became excited. "That's a foolish answer," he said, "a crazy answer. Do you think that 'Do' means 'consecrate'?"

"Why not?" asked Tyrrell. "You have only to look at the context. By themselves the words do not mean that, but they do if you take Christ's previous action into account. If you cannot see what I mean, I will give you an example. Suppose you are writing, and then you pass me the pen, and say 'Do this'. Would I not be justified in thinking that you meant me to write, even though 'do this' does not mean 'write' except in the context of your previous action?"

The Dean then changed the subject, and the argument went on to the well-worn controversial tracks of communion under one kind, and private Masses. Some years before, Dean Goodman had translated the first Epistle to the Corinthians for the Bishops' Bible; which may explain why the majority of the Scripture texts which he used during this discussion were taken from that Epistle.

Towards the end of the argument, he objected to the

Church's ceremonial practice. Tyrrell answered him by a parable. "Suppose I were going to see the Queen," he said, "on some important business. I could state the essentials of my case in a few words; but in the presence of such a noble Lady it is only fitting that I should wear my best clothes, remove my hat, kneel down, behave respectfully, and perhaps make a little speech beforehand to win her favour. That is how we behave in church when we are addressing God."

The Dean then turned to the subject of vernacular services; but he grew weary of an argument in which (at least on Tyrrell's showing) he was continually worsted. He tried unsuccessfully to shake the prisoner's resolve by threats and promises, and then handed him over to the gaoler of the Gatehouse (the prison next to the Abbey close). Nichols was thanked profusely, but he was not popular with the bystanders, some of whom openly sympathized with Tyrrell. One of the Dean's servants took his hand and asked him if he intended to persevere as a Catholic. "Until death itself," said Tyrrell, "if God gives me grace." "God grant it be so," said the servant. "If ever I can do anything for you, you will find me ready."

On the next day Tyrrell was taken to the Bishop of London's palace at St Paul's: going from Annas to Caiphas, he called it. There the bishop, John Aylmer (who had a bad reputation with Protestants as well as Catholics for his overbearing manners), examined him before a large audience, which included Bishop Young of Rochester and another bishop. The interview is best described in Tyrrell's own words.

"When Aylmer heard my name, he called me over and asked:

" 'Are you a Romish priest?'

" 'I am a priest,' I answered, 'ordained at Rome.'

" 'Who gave you a dispensation to go about in lay clothes?' he asked.

" 'The wickedness of the times,' I answered.

" 'Are you sure it wasn't the Pope, the man who gives you dispensations to go whoring?'

" 'The Pope cannot dispense, and never has dispensed, in matters of the natural law.'

"'That's a lie,' he said. 'Why, he has given a dispensation for incest: look at the case of King Philip.'¹

"'That was not incest,' I explained. 'King Philip married within a degree which was forbidden only by positive law; and in a case like that the Pope may dispense for a serious and urgent reason.'

"'What?' cried Aylmer. 'Do you mean that the Mosaic Law is still in force?'

"'No,' I replied. 'Not for ceremonial matters, but it is where morals are concerned.'

"'Never mind,' he said. 'I know that you are trying to make out that everything is lawful for the Pope, and that he can do whatever he pleases.'

"'I told him that this was untrue, so he started to talk about my clothes again.'

"'Christ and the Apostles,' he said, 'did not go about like that when they set out to preach the Gospel.'

"'That's not the point,' I replied. 'Religion consists in faith, not in clothes.'

"'You who claim to follow in Christ's footsteps,' he insisted, 'should go about exactly as he did. Since you do not, I should like you to show me some example from the Scriptures in which the Apostles went about like that.'

"'I started to think. What he said was not to the point, but I had to say something to satisfy those who were listening. The only illustration which came to my mind was the case of Judith, which I explained as well as I could.'

"'When Bethulia was besieged by Holofernes,' I began, 'Judith decided to free herself and her people from his tyranny. Though she had long been a widow in mourning, she put on her gayest clothes, and covered herself with jewellery. And so Holofernes was ensnared by her beauty (or rather her trickery) and had his head cut off, and the whole nation was liberated. In the same way, we, seeing our people besieged by heretics, put off the clothes of our widowhood (I mean our priesthood) and wear bright garments so that we may trick the heretics and keep ourselves safe from their anger.'

¹ Philip II's first wife was his cousin, Maria of Portugal.

"That story is about a woman," complained Aylmer, 'not about Christ or the Apostles.'

"The case is exactly the same," I insisted. 'But if you don't like that example, and you still want to be so strict with us as to make us follow Christ even in clothing, let me ask you this. How is it that you don't follow Christ and the Apostles either in clothing or faith or dogma or morals? Christ and the Apostles walked barefoot, wore the simplest clothing, lived unmarried, and suffered the greatest poverty. You do nothing of the kind. Why then do you blame us for the clothes which we are forced to wear to do our duty?'

"Aylmer made no answer. Instead, he tried to frighten me with threats of insult. 'I will have you led round the whole city,' he threatened, 'with a placard inscribed back and front "This is a Romish priest".'

"The disciple is not above his master,' I replied, 'and I only wish that I were worthy to suffer insult for Christ's sake. If you deign to do me this honour, I shall be for ever grateful.'

"Never mind about that," said Aylmer. 'We must get back to the point. Why did you come from Rome to England?'

"To preach the Gospel of Christ," I replied, 'and to teach the people the Catholic Faith, and to administer the Sacraments.'

"Well, now," he asked, 'wouldn't you like to convert us all to the Roman faith?'

"I should like to convert you all to the Catholic Faith," I said.

"Don't you mean the Roman Faith?"

"I mean the Catholic Faith."

"Then the Bishop of Rochester interrupted. 'What!' he cried. 'Are you afraid to say "The Roman Faith" when it is your own faith? Are you ashamed to confess your religion openly?'

"I am not ashamed," I answered him, 'but I said "The Catholic Faith" partly because that is the Faith which they hold at Rome, and partly because I know that you want to trap me, and convict me of High Treason.' They have a law, you see, in our country, that anyone who says openly that he professes the Roman religion is guilty of High Treason.¹

¹ It was, in fact, treason not to *profess* "the Romish religion", but to *reconcile* anyone to it. Hence the point of Aylmer's question.

" 'This I will say,' I continued. 'I would like to convert you all to the Catholic Faith, which is the same as the Roman Faith. Now go ahead, and draw your conclusions.'

" 'Aha,' said Aylmer. 'Now he has spoken plainly, now he has finished quibbling. He has stated that he wants to convert us to the Roman Faith.'

" 'I said what I said, no more and no less,' I replied.

" 'He is guilty of High Treason,' said Aylmer. 'Take him to prison, and put him in irons.'

" 'At last,' I said, 'you have found an argument I cannot answer. It is the first you have found today.'

" 'And that was the end of our wrangling for that day.'

A few days later Tyrrell was again brought out of the Gatehouse to be examined before Bishop Aylmer, this time in the house of the Dean of Westminster. The Bishop of Rochester was again present, and as he came in Aylmer turned to him and said: "Greetings, my Lord Bishop. How is your dear wife today?" Then, turning to Tyrrell: "Next time you write to Rome," he said, "tell them you saw two bishops in England asking each other after their wives. We are not like your Roman cardinals and bishops who ask each other after their whores and bastards."

"That old libel again!" said Tyrrell. "You are like your ancestors the Jews, who calumniated Christ and the Apostles: but your calumny can do us no harm."

"How long were you in Rome?" asked the bishop.

"About two years."

"And yet you dare to contradict what I say? I dare say on my conscience that you were guilty of worse than whoring in Rome."

"Then you must have a dirty conscience," answered Tyrrell. "God will judge us both on the judgement day."

After that, the bishop went on to the more serious business of Tyrrell's examination. He could not persuade him to take an oath to answer all the questions truthfully. Most of the questions dealt with the English College in Rome: who were the Superiors, when was it founded and why, how were priests sent to England. Tyrrell answered many of the questions frankly, but

gave away nothing which he thought could endanger others. He was then taken back to the Gatehouse, where he remained throughout the summer and autumn of 1581.¹

On 18 July he wrote to a friend at the English College: "What will happen to me in the future, only God knows, to whose providence I have resigned myself entirely. . . . The fees which they charge me here come to about ten and a half scudi a month,² but despite this I have never been short of money. God has provided so well for me until now that I have never lacked anything and indeed I have money to spare. When I have paid all expenses for this month, prison costs included, I shall still have forty scudi to spare, all given me as alms by Catholics. With these I hope to help others who are more strictly confined and less happily placed for receiving alms. May God reward all these benefactors: please give them a place in your prayers.

"That is all the news about myself; and now the best news I can give you is to tell you a little about our brothers and friends who throng these blessed prisons for the same cause. Fr Sherwin, once the Pope's scholar in the English College at Rome, was recently threatened with the rack and death as well. He is not frightened by the threats, but hopes with all his heart that God will make them come true. We shall soon know what is to become of him. Certainly, as far as pain is concerned, it is better to suffer death once for all, than these long repeated tortures. That is what they all say in the Tower: and yet there is not one of them who does not desire from his heart that God may make him worthy to suffer any torture, and death itself, rather than offend his Divine Majesty in the least detail. Already many of them have suffered excruciating tortures because they refused to consent to a slight sin. Some have been put into an iron instrument of torture which they call here 'The Scavenger's daughter'. In this, they put your head, feet and

¹ The account of Tyrrell's capture and his discussions with Goodman and Aylmer is an abbreviated translation of a Latin letter which he wrote from the Gatehouse to the Rector of the English College in Rome on 5 June 1581 (Roman Archives S.J., Anglia 30, 157-9).

² A scudo was worth five shillings of the English money of the time. Fees in the Tower were slightly cheaper: 9s. 2d. a week, which would be less than eight scudi a month. The pension at the English College in Rome at this time cost about six and a half scudi a month.

knees close together, rolling you up into a sort of ball, and then by tightening a screw they compress all your limbs. After an hour and a half of this treatment the poor victim begins to shed blood all over his body, especially from the hands and feet. Two people have been married to this pretty girl, Mr Cottam and Fr Luke Kirby, once of the English College at Rome. Others, like Fr Sherwin and Mr Bryant, have been tortured twice on the rack, and Johnson once. Fr Hart, whose brother is in the Pope's college at Rome, was laid on the rack for three hours without its being extended: they did this in the hope of frightening him. They have done the same to two others, one of whom had a delicate constitution. After a time, he could bear it no longer and yielded a little; but when he came to himself he suffered great remorse. Perhaps they will give him the martyr's palm all the sooner.¹

"Some others have been put in the Walesbower, which is a huge cave without any light, a foul and dirty place. Mr Johnson and Thomas Brisco (a student of the College in Rome), and Fr Bryant of Rheims College, are all living there. Others have been put in very narrow cells, stripped of their clothes, and cut off from all human comfort and assistance: they are entirely alone, and cannot see or speak to anyone at all. Fr Bryant spent a very long time without eating, and when he was half dead with hunger, they put him twice upon the rack, as I have said. Their latest fortune was to put sharp iron needles underneath his nails. He was in terrible pain, but thank God he bore up and showed himself more constant than ever. Every day I expect the like treatment, and so does Fr Rishton my companion, whose company I share now in prison as I shared it once in freedom at the College in Rome. May God grant us to be just as brave as our friends when it is our turn to suffer the same pains."²

¹ Bl. Ralph Sherwin and Bl. Luke Kirby were both fellow-students with Tyrrell at Rome; and while there he would probably have met Bl. Thomas Cottam, S.J. The man who broke down was probably John Hart, who temporarily recanted on 1 December (when Campion, Sherwin, and Bryant were martyred). Tyrrell tells the story obliquely so as to spare the feelings of Fr Hart's brother William (not the martyr) then at Rome. All the tortures are recorded in the *Diarium Turris*.

² Bl. Robert Johnson was an alumnus of the Germanicum in Rome; Brisco, a lay student from the English College. The torture of Bryant was intended to make him reveal the whereabouts of Fr Persons. Edward Rishton, a stocky Yorkshireman with a pale face and a short yellow beard, shared a cell with Tyrrell from June until December 1581, except for periods of solitary confinement.

Tyrrell and Rishton in the Gatehouse were not tortured as were those in the Tower; but after Fr Campion was brought into the Tower on the 22 July, the conditions in both prisons were made harsher. In his next letter to the Rector of the English College, written in October, Tyrrell wrote:

"We are now guarded with such strictness in this prison, that we can scarcely whisper a word without its being overheard and reported to our gaoler. Hence there is hardly any opportunity for writing letters: but God's providence has granted me a short space of time to tell my friends still in freedom whether I am alive or dead. Of all my friends, there is none to whom I owe more than your Reverence: so I should like you to know how we are faring. You must make sure that the more danger we are in, the more prayers are said for us in the College. Under the shield of God's providence, we are still alive, and still breathing; but our enemies threaten us every day with death. They grant us nothing but misery and hardship, and stop at nothing. They allow us no rest, and there is hardly any form of cruelty which they have not used in an effort to make us yield. When they see that one type or cruelty is not succeeding, they invent another. There is hardly one of us who has not had his limbs stretched and torn; but that type of torture was not a success, so now they are trying to kill us by starvation. We are all in separate cells: we can no longer receive visits from the friends who used to come and see us, nor can we even talk to each other. Nothing is allowed to be brought to us from outside, and we are not even allowed to beg alms from passers-by—a thing which is never refused to the worst scoundrels and criminals. I do not know how they can bring themselves to do it unless (as I said before) they want to deprive us of all support so that we shall all die one by one of slow starvation."¹

At this time the eyes of all the London prisoners (and of all England) were on Edmund Campion. Tyrrell describes in glowing terms the debates which the Jesuit had had with Protestant divines, relating how he had emerged victorious from the conflict, though unprepared, unequipped with books, and weak

¹ This letter (in Latin), like the last (in Italian, translated from an English original), is in the Roman archives S.J., fondo Gesuitico 651. It is typical of Tyrrell to write as if he had shared the sufferings which were mainly confined to the Tower.

from torture. "A woman from the Queen's court," he writes, "(distinguished for her nobility if not for her virtue) came as a spectator to one of the disputations. She was most impressed by Campion's elegant and witty speech, his modesty, and all his other virtues. 'It would be very foolish,' she said, 'ever to let him take part in a really public debate. The whole world would run after him.' "

On the 19 November one of the warders came to Tyrrell's cell in the Gatehouse, and told him and Rishton that they would be tried on the following day. Delighted by the news, the two priests made their confessions to each other, and prepared for martyrdom. But on the next day, the governor of the prison told them that only Rishton was wanted for trial. Tyrrell was left alone, puzzled and upset at being deprived, at the last minute, of the hope of martyrdom. But he need not have envied his companion. Rishton was tried indeed, and condemned to death along with Campion, Sherwin and the rest. But the sentence was never carried out; he was transferred to the King's Bench prison, and finally banished to France where he died in 1585.

On 1 December 1581 Fr Campion and his two companions were martyred. Tyrrell's gaoler was among the crowd which saw them being dragged to Tyburn. On his return to the Gatehouse, he went to the priest's cell. "Mr Tyrrell," he said, "what evil times we live in! What greater cruelty could there be than this murder of good men? I wish I was far away from here, so that I need not see such sights, and could live according to the Church's laws. I wish we were both overseas, free from the company of wicked men and the persecutions of enemies!"

"I am very glad," replied Tyrrell, "to see that God has touched your heart. But I do not understand what you mean by saying that you wish we were both out of the country. You are a free man, and can leave when you wish, but I am a prisoner, and cannot do any such thing."

"There is no difficulty," said the gaoler, "if you really want to leave. I will find a way to escape without any danger to yourself or harm to others." And so he did: though unfortunately, Tyrrell, when he told the story later, did not feel free to give any details. All we know is that he broke prison a few days later, and that he was at Lady Paget's at Drayton for four days at the

beginning of January 1582. He arranged for the gaoler and his wife to be reconciled to the Church, and to obtain a more congenial post.

He next went north, and worked in Yorkshire with two of his friends from the College in Rome, Mr Thomas Bell and Mr William Hart. Hart was later martyred, and Bell was one of the most influential priests in the North of England. Once a Cambridge parson, he had been converted by reading the Fathers, and had been imprisoned in York Castle. Later, he became one of the first students of the College at Rome, and on his return to England won a great reputation by secretly entering York Castle and ministering to the prisoners there for fourteen days. His greatest exploit is described by Tyrrell in a passage which deserves quoting in full.¹

"Four other priests joined Fr Bell, and all entered the prison secretly to sing a High Mass together. A day was fixed² and all the Catholics in the town were informed. Very many of them, both men and women, went to the prison by night and were let in secretly. I must tell you how they got in. A river ran through the town [of York] and flowed right past the Castle in which the Catholics were imprisoned. It was big enough to hold boats, which used to take the Catholics of the town quite comfortably to the foot of the Castle walls at night-time. The prisoners inside had a rope ladder which they let down for the Catholics outside to climb up. Such visits had become a regular custom: in this way husbands and wives and friends had a chance to see each other.

"That was how the priests got into the Castle on this occasion to sing the Mass. Quite a crowd entered with them, and everyone was so delighted that they made a noise which could be heard in the guardroom. The governor of the prison suspected that the Catholics were responsible for the noise, so he posted sentinels in various secret places, who soon found out about all the comings and goings, as you shall hear.

"All during the night the priests were busy hearing confessions. The following morning four Masses were said, and

¹ Roman archives S.J. Angl. 30, 296 (Tyrrell to Agazzari, April 1584). A less detailed account of the event in Yepes, p. 410.

² 22 July 1582 (Yepes, *Istoria Particular*, p. 410).

after them a fifth with great solemnity. It was sung with full music, with a deacon and subdeacon, which is a very rare sight for our English Catholics, especially for those in prison. At the same Mass all the Catholics went to Communion: there must have been about fifty of them. There were two sermons during the day, and many other celebrations which it would take too long to describe. When evening came and it was time for them all to leave, the ladder was let down with a rope beside it for people to hold in their hands for greater safety during the descent to the ground. First of all the laymen went down with one of the priests,¹ while the other four priests waited in the Castle intending to follow immediately.

"While they were getting ready to descend, a great noise was heard in the lower part of the Castle.² The Philistines leapt out of their caves—I mean the governor of the prison with his soldiers—and set on our people. Some were caught in one place, others in another, and this went on until everybody had been captured and locked up in the cells.³

"When they heard the shouting and the noise, those who were still up above in the Castle hurried back to find a secret place in which they could hide. They expected the Governor to arrive at any moment, so they had to pull down the altar which had been set up in one of the cells for the Masses. When everything had been stowed away they all went in to a hiding-hole.

"And then something happened which is worth recording. As it is the custom in Catholic churches to reserve the Blessed Sacrament, these devout men used to keep a host in a pyx. The priests took this with them into the hiding-hole, and though it was not long since they had broken their fast, they decided to consume the Host, for fear of the Blessed Sacrament suffering

¹ This was Bl. William Lacey, a married Yorkshireman who had taken orders in Rome in 1581 after his wife's death.

² Caused, says Yepes, by one of the Catholics stumbling on his way to the cell where the priests were.

³ This refers to those who were already at the foot of the walls. When Mr Lacey saw that capture was imminent, he threw away his wallet which contained his Ordination certificate (which he carried with him to prove to Catholics that though once married to a widow, he was now a priest). But it was found the next day and used as evidence against him at his trial. He was martyred on 22 August 1582.

some sacrilege at the hands of unbelievers. It was a very dark night, and the place was pitch black, so they had to do everything by touch. When they were trying to take the host out of the pyx, it fell from their hands on to the ground, and because the darkness of the place they could not find it anywhere. They did not dare to move or get up for fear of treading on it. They were forced to shout for a light, and loudly enough to be heard by almost everybody.

"A light was brought in answer to their shout, and they made a search. They could not find what they were looking for, which made them puzzled and very upset. They told everybody to pray, and after the prayer had been said they found the host, strange to relate, in a very distant corner, in a perfectly clean place away from all danger. Filled with spiritual joy, they gave thanks to God and very humbly received Communion.

"All this time the Governor of the prison with his minions was busy rounding up Catholics and putting them in irons.¹ If he had come upstairs at the start he would have found the priests searching for a hiding-place, and would certainly have captured them. But God decreed otherwise, for he and his soldiers did not come up until all the priests had been hidden away, along with the sacred vessels and vestments.

"At last the Governor arrived, fuming with rage. His men had lanterns and torches, and he shouted to them to search the cells. Cursing and swearing, he examined every nook. He said that he knew that there were many people still concealed, and that he knew where they were hiding. He went along the walls systematically, feeling them with his hands, and touched the actual spot where the priests were hiding. But the Lord God blinded his eyes as once he blinded the eyes of the men of Sodom. He left the place where the Catholics lived and went in search elsewhere. In the end he went downstairs again with his whole troop.

"Then one of the Catholic prisoners went to call the priests out of hiding, and persuaded them to try to escape. When they reached the place for climbing down, they found that the ladder had been removed but that the rope was still hanging there. They grasped this in their hands and slid down one after

¹ According to Yepes, only five were captured besides Mr Lacey.

the other. When they reached the ground they were still surrounded by a deep moat, and could not find a boat anywhere. They discussed what to do: they could not sail across without a boat, and it was too deep to cross on foot, so they seemed to be in as great a danger as ever. Walking round the inside of the moat, they came across a plank placed crosswise in the river.¹ It was only a few inches broad, so they were forced to sit astride and paddle with their hands to get across the river. But they overcame this difficulty and reached the town shortly after midnight. Thus, by God's grace, Fr Hart and Fr Bell with two others escaped the clutches of our enemies."²

It is possible that Tyrrell himself was one of the two other priests; but it would be unlike him to describe in the third person a story of which he was one of the heroes. He is next heard of at Rheims in the following year, when the Douai diary records him as having been "sent to England" on the 17 September 1583. If he did go to England, he cannot have stayed there long, for he was writing letters from Rheims in March and April of 1584. In September of the same year, he visited the English College at Rome in company with John Ballard of Babington Plot fame, and stayed there for twenty-four days.

No one would have blamed Tyrrell if, at this point of his life, he had decided never to return to England. Many other priests, after a few years' activity in England, and a term of imprisonment followed by banishment, considered their missionary duty done, and settled down to end their days in a comfortable chaplaincy in Flanders or a canonry in Spain. Tyrrell did not. He returned to England, to face renewed persecution with the prospect of further imprisonment and possible martyrdom. In fact, of course, he was not going to be martyred. He was going to thrice recant and thrice repent; he was going to betray his fellow-priests to death, to live with a woman whom

¹ "*tabulam e transverso fluminis positam*"—probably a sort of dyke.

² Among those captured was Mr Hart's servant, a sixteen-year-old lad who was holding his cloak, wallet and breviary. He was repeatedly whipped at the Lord Mayor's orders, but refused to betray his master. None the less, Bl. William Hart was captured soon after and martyred on 15 March 1583.

Thomas Bell continued to be one of the most respected priests in Yorkshire until 1592, when, apparently without any pressure being brought to bear on him, he apostatized and became a Government spy and Protestant apologist.

he always knew was not his wife, and to count himself lucky to die at last once more at peace with the Church.¹ That was the future which awaited him as he sailed across the Channel in 1585. But how could he know that?

ANTHONY KENNY

A NEW GENERATION OF CATHOLIC WRITERS

A SURVEY

ONCE upon a time in England, "little reviews" provided regular platforms for up-and-coming writers: during the war *Horizon*, *New Writing* and *The Wind and the Rain* launched over a hundred between 1940 and 1946. But with the subsequent post-war rise in printing costs, in the course of a decade the number of such reviews has fallen from about fifty to fifteen—most of them adopting the form of a news sheet, or else being run off on duplicating machines and stapled by hand. They are sold principally in London's coffee-bars, which have taken the place of the coffee-houses of the seventeenth century: in areas such as Hampstead, Soho and Chelsea they live up to their old reputation of "penny universities". Yet few of these broadsheets or typewritten magazines survive a year—whereas all the three that I mentioned at the beginning lasted all through the forties. The tendency for new writers is to go to new publishers and consequently produce short books rather than short stories or articles; and these new publishers in turn are fulfilling a function similar to that of little review editors of the past. I name some alphabetically: André Deutsch—a man in his thirties; Rupert Hart-Davis—a man in his forties; Peter Owen—a man in his twenties. These are among the more enterprising firms

¹ For the story of Tyrrell's later life, see Vol. II of Fr Morris's *Troubles of our Catholic Forefathers*, and the article "An Unwilling Apostate" by Christopher Devlin in *The Month* for December 1951.

that have sprung up, and it is a noticeable fact that each Christmas when the Sunday papers invite their critics to select "the best books of the year", on the last seven occasions it has been such firms that have gained more than half the choices; and yet statistically few of these houses produce more than twenty-five books a year as opposed to the average annual output of two to three hundred by the older and more established houses.

Such, then, is the background of English publishing. . . . Yet I do not wish to suggest that the more established firms have fallen asleep. As I hope to show—in some cases—they have been very quick off the mark. For in this survey I want to limit myself to English writers under forty—to poets, novelists, critics and biographers who are beginning to hold the attention of the older generation. A second book is often a testing-point; no author I mention has produced less than two. I begin with a poet. . . .

Charles Causley was most highly praised by the late Roy Campbell. His first two books came from the Hand & Flower Press in Kent and his third from Hart-Davis entitled *Union Street* comprises a selection from the first two plus a good number of new poems. He has a strong sense of the vernacular and narrative—both of which were characteristics of Campbell's own poetry; and like him he can use a similar kind of line. Thus Campbell on the "Nativity"—"shepherds and kings and cowboys knelt around"—and Causley in an epithalamium and birthday tribute to an elder poet:

Then with cats, angels, saints, thugs, for the dark
Take love the last unconfidential clerk . . .

Recently, too, he has written a television programme to celebrate the sailing of *Mayflower II*. I quote three quatrains about her three masts—their reason, rhyme and symbolism—three strands lashed into one unity:

One stands at the Fore
To meet the weather wild,
For He who once in winter
Was a little child.

One grows after
From step to the sky,
For He who once was keel-hauled
And hung up to die.

One stands amidships
Between Fore and Mizzen,
Pointing to Paradise
For He who is risen.

As a critic, the same poet once described Elizabeth Myers' stories as being as "lively as a basket of eels". This is equally true of his own work.

Elizabeth Myers, who died ten years ago at the age of thirty-four, was the greatest loss that Catholic letters suffered after the war. Graham Greene, Antonia White and Evelyn Waugh were left to carry on, but the question was not who were to be their followers, but *who were to be their successors*. There were many imitations of characters such as Scobie and Bendrix and copies of the convent scenes in *Frost in May*, but as I am concerned here with the post-war arrival of fresh individual talent I automatically think first of Aubrey Mennen and Elizabeth Sewell—both Chatto & Windus authors—of whom I shall say more anon. Yet the most original voice to speak since Elizabeth Myers' death is that of Isobel English, another novelist and short-story writer.

Poets are often the most perceptive critics of novels; one thinks of Eliot launching Djuna Barnes's *Nightwood*, or Roy Campbell translating the satires of Eça de Queiroz. Today in England the best fiction reviewers are Edwin Muir and John Betjeman. Of *Every Eye* by Isobel English (whose appearance coincided with the 1956 Budapest uprising) Betjeman wrote in the *Daily Telegraph*: "Here is an author who has exploded the dying myth that the novel is becoming extinct." He quoted for approval this sentence: "Now we are swinging through France down the lighted tracks where all night long men in berets and butcher blue dungarees sweat rough wine and oil through their red and open pores." This is the author's second book in the last three years; her first, *The Key That Rusts*, went into three editions (Deutsch). Both are carefully mapped—and I

use the word mapped to suggest that, as geographers distinguish between magnetic and true north, so this novelist makes a subtle difference between what looks like truth and what is truth. Both books contain childhood scenes set in Brittany—evocations of those vast tracts of heather and orchard covered with salt and sand, the white-winged peasant women in their lace coiffs, and the warm cobblestones of the narrow streets of the straggling villages. It is not surprising that Paris also should have had a publisher ready for such a writer. For with two novels up and a third nearly finished, this is England's most promising novelist. I hesitate to use the term genius, but for once I will let it go.

Also from Deutsch comes Brian Moore, a remarkably brilliant novelist. He has two books to his credit, *Judith Hearne* and *The Feast of Lupercal*. Belfast features in both, and Moore has done for Northern Ireland and its capital what Joyce did for Southern Ireland and its capital. But if he is a rebel he is not an exile. The distinction is important. His characters may be let down by priests, they may be palmed off with repository art—and yet in their final rebellion they are reconciled; not for an instant has their belief, or power to believe, been in doubt. Ineffective advice in the confessional, ecclesiastical back-biting—these failings never invalidate the real truths such as that Christ died on the Cross not to safeguard the standards of respectability, but to save men from their sins. There are moments in both of Moore's novels when some of the sayings of Léon Bloy come to mind. Yet he is a writer with a stricter sense of literary discipline than the author of *La Pauvre Femme*.

So far Vincent Cronin has not produced a novel. He began with a travel book about Sicily and followed it up with a life of Matteo Ricci, *The Wise Man from the West*; at present he is engaged on the biography of another Jesuit missionary, while in the meantime there is his current travel book, *The Last Migration* (Hart-Davis). Travel book, however, is a debatable description. After the first chapter it becomes the portrait of the leader of a wandering Persian tribe; one might go further and say that it is fiction based on fact, for it would seem that what the author has really done is to concentrate all that he heard and saw on his journey and to lay such experiences upon

the shoulder of one man—not entirely imaginary, but a composite shadow of many different tribal chiefs. The truth achieved by this means resembles poetic truth. I recall T. E. Lawrence's rebuke to a proof reader who queried the various spellings of a horse's name. "Which was right?" asked the reader. "Both," replied the author: "She was a damn good horse." For Cronin has done for Persia in *The Last Migration* what Lawrence did for the Arabs in *The Seven Pillars of Wisdom*. It is his boldest book to date, full of subtly observed touches as when the Ghazan of the Falqani is questioned about the ignorance of his followers by a team of Western educational exports. How many languages do they speak, inquires the head expert. Two—Persian and Turki, replies their king and then adds as an afterthought: "Three even, for they have a special way of addressing their beasts."

As I say, Vincent Cronin has not yet proved himself a novelist, but rather more an imaginative biographer whose work borders on the edge of fiction. Elizabeth Sewell might be called an imaginative critic, although she has proved herself also a novelist as well as a short-story writer. So far she has published a study on Nonsense Verse, a comparative study of Mallarmé and Rimbaud, and a short monograph on Paul Valéry. Her mentor is really Chesterton; she has a similar addiction for paradoxes and, although her arguments are much better documented than his, they are no less original. Critically, she can make the most tremendous leaps: from the *Ancient Mariner* to *Batteau Ivre* or *The Hunting of the Snark*, since (in her view) the balance in the mind between order and disorder can only be held in poetry by the means of laughter and religion. This is the thesis that she expands in all her books, dogmatically in her literary studies, creatively in her novels and short stories. *The Help-Meet* is one of her finest stories. Here is an allegory of the Garden of Eden and the creation of woman, with Adam as the patient and God as the psychiatrist—though to use these terms is immediately to give away very bluntly what is only very cunningly revealed. The last sentence is always a pleasure to recall:

He lay very still, hearing the water splash over the ford; but she pulled the dry grass stems out of his hair, smiling already for

love of man's foolishness, and looked out over the top of his head to where the scarlet-crested woodpeckers ran up and down in little snake-like coils of green fire through the apple trees of Paradise.

And this last sentence also reminds one that she has published a slim volume of religious and humorous verse.

Into such disfavour has fallen the term journalist that I pause before applying it to John M. Todd and Derek Stanford, the former a convert, the latter a High Anglican. But I keep to the word because they do both show a remarkable ability to present their subject-matter from a remarkable number of different angles; they are both very quick workers—and it was perhaps typical that Stanford should have been the first critic to publish studies of Christopher Fry and Dylan Thomas (Spearman), two pioneer studies that will prove indispensable to anybody else who writes about either this dramatist or poet. Likewise, it was to be expected that Todd would follow up his first book on the Lay Apostolate, *We Are Men* (Sheed & Ward), with one on the reunion of the Churches, and sure enough last year he brought out a very thorough study of *The Ecumenical Movement and Catholicism* (Longmans). At present he is just completing a book on *John Wesley and the Catholic Church* (Hodder & Stoughton).

Paul Jennings is a journalist with a difference. The late Robert Lynd was his nearest predecessor. His pieces take the form of fortnightly essays on different oddities in life—the names of the stops on an organ, or the mystic element in banks with their strange figures whispering behind counters and their secret deeds that none witness once the doors are closed to the public. Such pieces are fantasies, but fantasies that catch at the poetry of life. He has published four volumes, all under variations of the title *Oddly Enough* (Reinhardt). Not since the heyday of Belloc and Chesterton has there been a finer essayist.

Now I come to five more novelists. Christine Brooke-Rose published a long poem called *Gold* (Hand & Flower Press) and has for six or seven years been working on an exhaustive study of Metaphor, which is due to appear at the end of 1958. Suddenly this year she took off six weeks and has just published a

light-hearted satire about London literary life under the title of *The Language of Love* (Secker & Warburg). Jerczy Pietrkiewicz is a Pole now writing in English. *The Knotted Cord* (Heinemann) was his first book, but his second, and more interesting, was a collection of Polish folk-lore stories: some reviewers described it as an off-beat book—which was true (although, if not as novel, at least as an addition to the history of folk-lore I suspect that it has a good chance of survival). Aubrey Mennen is well known; he began publishing ten years ago, but it was not until five years ago that he dedicated a novel to his parents with the inscription, "the first work of my maturity". *The Duke of Gallodoro* opens with a characteristic paragraph in his own particular vein of satire. "*Duca di Gallodoro* . . . is best translated as The Duke Upstairs. He is called this because he lives on top of a hill." Gabriel Fielding (a distant descendant of the eighteenth-century writer) began with *Brotherly Love* (Hutchinson) and has followed it up with a promised trilogy whose first volume is *In the Time of Greenbloom*; here is storytelling at its most adroit and gripping (like the early A. J. Cronin); and here again is an author whose greatest power resides in depicting children and conveying the sense of natural evil such as exists, for instance, in some of the caves along the Welsh coast. Lastly there is Muriel Spark, who has written several critical biographies including one about Anne Brontë and another about John Masefield and whose first novel, *The Comforters* (Macmillan), deserves a paragraph on its own.

Who shall distinguish between symbol and symptom, dream and dreamer? This is a story about states of mind on one level; about smuggling and salvation on another. The comforters are guardians—not perhaps quite angels—but protectors of the heroine, Caroline Rose. For a third of the way through the author suddenly warns her readers: "At this point of the narrative, it might be as well to state that the characters . . . are all entirely fictitious." I suspect a certain punning over the word "fictitious", since Caroline has to discover that the sole way she has of *righting* her nervous breakdown is by *writing* about it. In accounting for her "typewriter voices" she calls in the help of an ex-lover; together, meeting on this new plane, they find that the characters of her real and novel's life merge so that for her

between symbol and symptom, illness and recovery, there is no sharp dividing line. The book only charts the course, leaving a reader to draw his own conclusions. . . . It should be added that the dialogue and orchestration of the background voices are superbly achieved.

.

All these writers that I have mentioned above are either in their twenties or thirties; most of them are Catholics, but there are two exceptions—Charles Causley and Derek Stanford; and I have included them because they write with particular understanding and sympathy about English Catholicism. And from a religious point of view the literary scene in England is extremely encouraging. Before the Second World War a critic might have pointed to Chesterton, Belloc and Baring, whilst describing Graham Greene, Antonia White and Evelyn Waugh as promising newcomers; now with these last three at the top, a critic can point in particular to Isobel English, Vincent Cronin, Elizabeth Sewell and Paul Jennings. Moreover, in any responsible survey this quartet would find a place, and what is more (and what marks the difference between the thirties and the fifties) is that their beliefs would not be called in question. They would be accepted as *writers* and as *Catholics*. For a great change of opinion took place in the forties. In the case of the three "little reviews" which I referred to at the beginning, *The Wind and the Rain* always had a Catholic bias, *New Writing* shifted editorially from Marxism to Anglicanism, and *Horizon*, constantly trying to hold a liberal balance, came more and more to call upon writers with pronounced religious convictions. This movement has in turn influenced publishing and the result is that many books which before the war would only have been issued by specifically religious firms are now coming from secular firms with general lists. For example, of all the titles I have mentioned here, only one comes from a firm known to be specifically Catholic. Nor do I think that my arguments suffer from special pleading since I would like to end with a postscript on those under twenty.

Last summer I had the experience of reading hundreds of

manuscripts by school children between the ages of fourteen and eighteen. The question they were asked was—"What is T. S. Eliot's Significance for Me?" Inevitably, going through them, I began to think how I would have tackled the same question at their age; how I would have brought in Auden, Spender, MacNeice and Day Lewis; but not once did I find these names—only those of John Betjeman and Dylan Thomas. Again, not only was there almost an unanimous agreement in rating the *Four Quartets* above *The Waste Land*, but dramatically both *The Cocktail Party* and *The Confidential Clerk* were preferred to *Murder in the Cathedral* and *The Family Reunion*. There was a feeling that in the later plays in some mysterious way the spectators were made participants in a drama not confined by the walls of the auditorium, but reaching out in such a way that one had life more abundantly. In trying to make clear their meaning, many of the children were undergoing a fight with words such as the poet had undergone himself: "And so each venture is a new beginning. . . ." Those who are so fond of repeating that "the English Novel is dead" or that "Western Democracy is spiritually bankrupt" may be given much to think about in a few years' time when many of these competitors have ceased to be school boys and girls and become instead grown men and women. Genius is never prodigal, but may the promise of some of them last.

NEVILLE BRAYBROOKE

IN CHRISTO IESU

THE central doctrine of St Paul's theology is our incorporation in Christ through baptism, as a result of the divine decree to renew all things in Christ. This "mystery" (Rom. xvi, 25; Col. i, 26, etc.) which he is sent to reveal to the Gentiles is enshrined in the Pauline formula "in Christ Jesus", which Sanday calls "one of the pillars of St Paul's theology". It occurs forty-eight times in his Epistles, and nowhere else in the whole of the N.T. (In I Peter v, 10, 14, the Greek is doubtful.) What is implied by this inversion of our Lord's names? It is

not enough to say with Sanday that "*in Christ Jesus* always relates to the glorified Christ, not to the historic Jesus" (*Romans* iii, 24, 1898); by putting His Messianic title first St Paul indicates our Lord in the completion of His redemptive office, in union with all those He has redeemed, and as Head of the Mystical Body. This union is regarded sometimes as an action, e.g. in Rom. vi, 3, we are baptized into Christ (*eis Christon Iesoun*), and sometimes as the result of this action, e.g. Gal. iii, 28, "you are all one in Christ Jesus (*en X.I.*)". The Vulgate translates these two meanings indifferently "*in Christo Iesu*". The precise meaning of this phrase must in each case be determined by the context; sometimes the emphasis is on Christ the Head, sometimes on us the members, but of one thing we can be certain, that it is never used without clear reference to the Mystical Body. It is often synonymous with the Catholic Church e.g. Eph. i, 1, "Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ, to the faithful at Ephesus in Christ Jesus", i.e. to the Catholic Church at Ephesus.

What is the origin of this formula? The phrase "*in Christ*" recalls our Lord's "Abide *IN ME*" (John xv, 4, etc.), and the whole of St Paul's doctrine of the Mystical Body is implicit in the parable of the Vine. But the origin of the inversion "*Christ Jesus*" is beyond our conjecture. No light is shed on it by the Form Critics' theory of local variants in the dominical titles, nor by Sanday's more reverent suggestion that the formula goes back to our Lord's own usage. It seems best simply to attribute it to St Paul, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. Deissmann himself regarded it as a Pauline creation.

It is hardly surprising to find "liberal" scholars, to whom the full doctrine of the Mystical Body is unacceptable, seeking some other explanation of this Pauline usage. Form Critics see in it no more than a growing consciousness of the Divinity of Christ. Lietzmann (1928) accepts the theory of von Dobschütz who explains "*Christ Jesus*" as an inversion originating in the attempt to avoid the ambiguity of the Greek declension of *Iesous*—yet there are eighty instances in St Paul of "*Jesus Christ*" (compared with eighty-eight of "*Christ Jesus*"), without ambiguity even in oblique cases. McCasland (JBL, 1946, pp. 377-83) rejects Lietzmann's explanation without attempting another, and concludes that "*Christ Jesus*" is an alternate form

of "Jesus Christ" with no difference in meaning. But this equation of the two forms is impossible. Apart from theological considerations, on which Fr Prat (*Theology of St Paul*, vol. ii) seems to have said the last word, the textual evidence alone rules it out. As long ago as 1891 Haussleiter noted that where the Greek reads *in Christ*, or *in Christ Jesus*, there is no single instance of a *varia lectio*, and a study of the latest editions of the N.T. (I have used Merk, 1948) confirms this. To students of the Greek text, familiar with the freedom with which copyists have altered other dominical titles, or added to them, this rare unanimity will be convincing. From this it is clear that although the formula has been studied scientifically only from the time of Deissmann, its significance must have been realized by the early copyists. Moreover, the Apostolic Fathers bear witness to the general understanding of the formula in the Greek and Latin Church. Sanday suggested their usage should be investigated, but went on to conclude, somewhat rashly, that by the time of St Ignatius of Antioch the distinction between "Christ Jesus" and "Jesus Christ" was obliterated. McCasland, who has made the investigation Sanday suggested, lists fifteen instances of "Christ Jesus"; using the text of Gebhardt-Harnack (1902) I can find only fourteen, but with a clear reference to the Mystical Body in each. It is true that St Ignatius uses the un-Pauline expression "in Jesus Christ" (Ephes. xx, 4) but only because he is here speaking of Christ "according to the flesh"; where he speaks of our being in the Mystical Body he keeps the Pauline "in Christ Jesus" (Ephes. xi, 1; especially xii, 2, with the mention of St Paul; Trall. ix, 2, etc.). Origen also preserves the distinction: in the preface to *Contra Celsum* (ed. Koetschau, 1899) we have "Christ Jesus" five times, referring to the Mystical Body, and "Jesus Christ" once, referring to the Person of our Lord, according to strict Pauline usage.

To sum up, therefore: Deissmann's explanation, as modified by Fr Prat, of the Pauline phrase "in Christ Jesus", still holds good. Because of its close connexion with St Paul's doctrine of the Mystical Body its importance is obvious and, with one exception, the attempt to equate "Christ Jesus" with "Jesus Christ" is confined to liberal theologians unable to accept the Catholic interpretation of that doctrine. The one exception is

the Knox Bible, where St Paul's distinction between the two titles is obliterated, and they are often altered without regard to the Greek or Latin text. To make my point clear I shall classify my criticisms under four heads.

I. *In Christo Iesu*. This is changed nine times to "In Jesus Christ", an expression which, as Fr Prat has pointed out, never occurs in St Paul. Thus Eph. i, 1, "Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ (the Person), to the faithful in Christ Jesus" (the Mystical Body), is altered to "Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ to . . . the faithful in Jesus Christ". It is worth noting that the Greek sometimes has variant readings giving "Christ Jesus" instead of "Jesus Christ", but there are no instances of the converse change, and it is this error that is so frequent in the Knox version. I Cor. iv, 15, "nam in Christo Iesu per evangelium ego vos genui", i.e. in the Mystical Body; one shrinks from the implications of making St Paul say in the Knox version "it was I that begot you in Jesus Christ". I Cor. xv, 31, is notoriously difficult; the Douai translated from the Vulgate word by word, "your glory, brethren, which I have in Christ Jesus our Lord", leaving its readers to guess the meaning. As in most texts that are obscure the Knox version does not fail us here: "by all the pride I take in you" really does translate "per vestram gloriam", but unfortunately this happy effect is marred in the sequel by inverting the title, and inserting "*in the name* of our Lord Jesus Christ", directing the reference to our Lord's Person, and excluding all mention of the Mystical Body. Gal. iii, 28, "you are all one in Christ Jesus" is altered to "you are all one person in Jesus Christ". Now we are one body, but not one person, in Christ; indeed, against this latter expression we are warned by Pope Pius XII in *Mystici Corporis Christi* (par. 85, C.T.S. edition) For reference, the other five texts thus altered are: I Cor. i, 4; Gal. ii, 16; I Thess. ii, 14; Col. i, 2; i, 4.

II. There are eleven further alterations of "Christ Jesus" to "Jesus Christ" without authority from the Latin or Greek (I omit all changes for which there is support, however slight, in the variant readings). In Col. i, 7, the Vulgate has "a faithful minister of Christ Jesus", the Greek "a faithful minister of the Christ"; the Knox version, discarding both, has "a faithful minister of Jesus Christ". So in Col. ii, 2, the alteration

"Jesus Christ" is found neither in the Greek (Christ) nor the Vulgate (Christ Jesus). The other instances of this change are: Rom. viii, 34; xv, 16; Col. iv, 12; I Tim. i, 1; i, 2; i, 12; ii, 5; v, 21.

III. In nine places the Greek has been preferred to the Vulgate. In Phil. iii, 8, the Vulgate (Jesus Christ) is more conformable to Pauline usage than the Greek, but in some places, especially II Cor. iv, 6, the Greek certainly seems preferable, but even here, since the title-page declares the translation to be from the Vulgate, we might have a footnote saying the Greek reading has been here preferred. In four places (Rom. xv, 5, 8; II Cor. iv, 5, 6) a certain Vulgate reading has been abandoned for an uncertain one in Greek. The other instances are: I Cor. iii, 11; Philemon i, 8; II John i, 3.

IV. Lastly there are eleven cases which, relying on Fr Prat's study of St Paul's theology, I venture to call serious mistranslations. I will list them first, and comment after: Rom. ix, 1; xvi, 3, 7, 9, 10; Gal. iii, 27; Col. ii, 6; I Thess. ii, 14; I Tim. iii, 13; II Tim. ii, 10; iii, 15.

In Rom. xvi, 7, "my fellow-prisoners who were in Christ before me" (i.e. who became Christians before me) we have a beautiful use of the Pauline "in Christ", lovingly recalling the IN ME of John xv, 4; this is altered to "who were in Christ's service before me" where we miss the reference to the Mystical Body, for to be in Christ's service is not the same thing as to be "in Me". Had St Paul wished to say "in Christ's service" his Greek would have been capable of expressing this idea. More serious is Gal. iii, 27, "as many of you as have been baptized in Christ have put on Christ", i.e. have been incorporated into Him—the parallel to Rom. vi, 3, is unmistakable. This is altered to "all you who have been baptized in Christ's name, have put on the person of Christ". I leave moral theologians to decide whether baptism in Christ's name would be valid (are not Acts ii, 38; viii, 16; x, 48; xix, 5, enough, without unnecessary difficulties?) and pass on to ask what can be meant by our putting on the *person* of Christ,—the Divine Person? Here again the Pope's warning in *Myst. Corp. Christi* is very relevant. Col. ii, 6, "sicut accepistis I.Ch. (var. lect. Ch. I.) in ipso ambulate" is translated "according to the *tradition* you have

received of him" offering us, instead of union with Christ, a preaching about Him. In I Tim. iii, 13, instead of "faith which is in Christ Jesus", meaning faith together with incorporation, we have "faith founded on Christ Jesus", narrowing the meaning to faith in the person of Christ, and excluding membership of his Body. In Rom. ix, 1, "I speak the truth in Christ (v. 1, Jesus)" the thought of the Mystical Body is present to St Paul's mind—"I, in Christ, speak the truth"—but the Knox version excludes it from the reader's by inserting "name": "I speak the truth in the name of Christ". Is there, then, no word for "name" in Greek? Again in Rom. xvi, 9, the reference to the Mystical Body, "Urbanus our helper in Christ Jesus", is excluded by the paraphrase "Urbanus who helped our work in Christ's cause"—which could have been said equally well of a non-Christian.

The effect of these changes and paraphrases is cumulative; they all weigh down one side of the scales by suppressing reference to the Mystical Body and representing the Pauline idea of salvation as a purely personal matter between the Christian and the person of Christ, as in Protestant theology, instead of a corporate salvation, as in Catholic theology, in union with the Mystical Body. It is true the excellent footnotes, so generously provided in this version, help to explain the doctrine of the Mystical Body; but notes, however learned, lack the authority of the sacred scripture itself, and, in any case, one is hardly justified in distorting an author's meaning in the text in order to have the pleasure of straightening it out again in the footnotes!

I should add that I have confined my criticism to the latest edition of the Knox Bible (1955) in which one is glad to see many of the errors concerning "Christ Jesus" in the previous edition corrected. This emboldens one to hope that the errors listed above may also be corrected in a future edition, and that these corrections may be extended to the Sunday Epistles and Gospels.

J. BARRETT DAVIES¹

¹ This article, written roughly years ago, was sent to the Editor only shortly before I heard that Mgr Knox was seriously ill. May I say how deeply I deplore his death, and regret that now it must be left to some blunter pen than his to rebuke my presumption, if such it be. I am glad that no word of this article has had to be changed because of his death; its tone, I think, makes clear the respect in which I held him.

J. B. D.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

CATHOLIC WITNESSES AT NON-CATHOLIC WEDDINGS

May a Catholic be best-man or bridesmaid at a non-Catholic wedding? (B.)

REPLY

Canon 1258, §1: "Haud licitum est fidelibus quovis modo active assistere seu partem habere in sacris acatholicorum."

§2: "Tolerari potest praesentia passiva seu mere materialis, civilis officii vel honoris causa, ob gravem rationem ab Episcopo in casu dubii probandam, in acatholicorum funeribus, nuptiis similibusque sollemniis, dummodo perversionis et scandali periculum absit."

A distinction must first be drawn between civil and religious weddings. *Per se*, there is nothing to prevent a Catholic acting as best-man or bridesmaid at a valid marriage of two non-Catholics, not bound by the canonical form, in a registry office. The contract has indeed that element of sacredness which, as Leo XIII emphasized, attaches to every valid marriage,¹ and, if both parties are baptized, each will administer to the other a grace-giving sacrament. But no "sacra acatholicorum", in the sense of canon 1258, are involved, because no religious rite is performed by or on behalf of any heretical or schismatical sect. If scandal is likely to be occasioned among uninstructed Catholics, who may perhaps conclude from the law of the Church in their own regard that registry office marriages are bad for all alike, steps must be taken to avert or dispel it, but that should not be difficult.

When, on the other hand, the contract is clothed with a non-Catholic religious ceremony, Catholics are forbidden in principle to be present at it, and the only question is whether the prohibition is absolute or conditional. The first paragraph of canon 1258 is not certainly a statement of the natural law,

¹ Enc. *Arcanum*, 10 February 1880.

but it is certainly an unconditional ecclesiastical law. It is never lawful for a Catholic to assist in any active way at the religious rites of a non-Catholic sect. Since the canon itself defines active assistance as "taking part in" the ceremony, the answer to the question proposed depends on whether the best-man and bridesmaid are simply among those present at the wedding ceremony, or, by the very nature of their function, play an integral part in it.

There has been no clear-cut official decision of the Holy See on this point. All we have is a series of particular answers dealing with concrete cases of varying circumstances.¹ In 1803, Propaganda returned an unqualified negative to the question whether Catholics could assist as witnesses at the marriages of schismatics; but when it later published this document,² it added a reference to a Holy Office Instruction of 1859 which tolerated such assistance in a case in which, so it was urged, the *patrini* merely stood alongside the groom, neither doing nor saying anything that might be deemed to signify participation of the forbidden kind.³

As to the moral theologians, the weight of opinion is certainly adverse to the lawfulness of the kind of assistance in question. Of those whom we have consulted, only Jorio says without qualification that it is lawful to function as a witness, his reason being that merely passive presence and material co-operation are involved.⁴ The majority declare without qualification that it is never lawful to act as witness, or "to give the bride away" (if this means presenting her to the minister), because these functions involve active participation in the religious rite and implicit recognition of the minister as authorized to conduct it.⁵

This is clearly a question of fact which must first be settled, and Genicot, at least in his *Casus Conscientiae*, rightly makes it

¹ For the text of four of these answers, cf. Canon McCarthy's full treatment of the question in *The Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, December 1950, p. 532.

² *Collectanea S.C.P.F.*, n. 672.

³ *Ibid.*, n. 1178.

⁴ *Theol. Mor.*, I, n. 239. Prummer, *Manuale T.M.*, I, n. 526, might seem to agree, but he assumes that the bridesmaid's function is purely honorary.

⁵ Cf. Merkelbach, *Summa T.M.*, I, n. 756; Lanza-Palazzini, *T.M.*, II, pars I, p. 68; Fanfani, *Manuale T.M.*, II, n. 41; Wouters, *T.M.*, I, n. 500; Regatillo-Zalba, *T.M. Summa*, I, n. 819; Genicot, *Inst. T.M.*, I, n. 201; Noldin, *Summa T.M.*, II, n. 39.

the deciding factor. "As regards the function of witness in a protestant marriage," he writes, "a distinction must be made according to whether or not, of its nature, it necessarily involves acknowledgement of the authority of the sect. If it does, e.g. if the presence of this witness is required by the laws of the sect for the validity of the marriage (more or less as in the Catholic Church), or if he or she has to take part in the sacred rite, it is unlawful. If not, it is *per se* lawful, for such assistance is considered a mere civility."¹ We cannot say which of these two situations is verified in all the various sects into which Protestantism has splintered. Fr Lydon tells us that, in America, "even in church . . . the ceremony is not regarded generally as sacred or religious",² an extraordinary statement which Hollywood reproductions of the scene make not incredible; and it may conceivably be true of some sects in this country. It can hardly be said, however, of the marriage service as conducted in the Anglican Church, for it is clearly intended and universally regarded as a religious ceremony performed by the minister on behalf of that Church. For Anglican weddings, therefore, the question is reduced to this: do the best-man and at least the principal bridesmaid take part in the rite, or, at least, is their presence required by the law of the Established Church for the validity of the marriage?

From the merely ceremonial point of view there is perhaps room for doubt, because the only person mentioned in the Prayer Book as playing an active part is the one who gives the bride away—"Who giveth this woman to be married to this man," asks the minister; the best-man and bridesmaid are not expressly called upon to contribute anything to the ceremony except their mere presence. On the other hand, it seems clear that their presence is required by Anglican law as an integral element of the rite. Admittedly the Prayer Book is not very explicit on this point. It merely speaks of the parties coming into the church, at the appointed time, "with their friends and neighbours", and of their exchanging their consent "before God

¹ *Casus Conscientiae*, ed. 2, I, p. 45. With some of the above-quoted authors, he accepts the assurance of Sabetti, in *The American Ecclesiastical Review*, June 1890, that in North America even the first bridesmaid is commonly held to perform a purely civil function.

² *Ready Answers in Canon Law*, p. 149 (quoted from McCarthy, loc. cit.).

and this company". But the mediaeval canon law of the Catholic Church in England required the presence of "several persons summoned for the purpose",¹ and it is generally accepted that the mediaeval canon law continued in force as customary law of the Reformed Church, except in so far as it was abrogated.² In any case, the Marriage Act of 1823, which has canonical force for the Established Church, requires that marriage "be solemnized by a person in holy orders and before not less than two credible witnesses besides".³

There seems no escaping the conclusion that at least the two required witnesses at an Anglican church wedding "partem habere in sacris acatholicorum", in the sense of the canon. If therefore it will involve standing in this capacity, no Catholic may, in our opinion, lawfully undertake to serve as best-man or principal bridesmaid at such a ceremony. This does not necessarily apply to the bevy of supernumerary bridesmaids who are occasionally brought along to grace the occasion with their matched gowns and posies. They are, or are meant to be, purely decorative. Their presence need not be more than "passive or merely material", in the sense of canon 1258, §2, and can therefore be tolerated for a grave reason of civil duty or respect. The same could be said even of the best-man and principal bridesmaid, if arrangements were made for them to enjoy the title and fulfil the social functions without participating in the ceremony as witnesses.

EVENING COMMUNION INDEPENDENTLY OF MASS

Under the new law of *Sacram Communionem*, may Holy Communion be given in the evening independently of Mass? It would be helpful to be able to give it to those who cannot get to church in the morning, or to take it in the evening to aged

¹ Lyndwood, *Provinciale*, ed. 1557, p. 198: "Ne dent sibi fidem mutuo de matrimonio contrahendo nisi in loco celebri, coram publicis et pluribus personis ad hoc convocatis."

² Cf. *The Canon Law of the Church of England*. S.P.C.K., 1947, pp. 47-8.

³ *Stephen's Commentaries on the Laws of England*, 13th ed., II, p. 235. In the proposed revision of the Anglican canons, No. XLII, 7, reads: "Every marriage shall be solemnized in the presence of two or more credible witnesses besides the minister who shall celebrate the same." It quotes Lyndwood and the 1823 Act as sources.

and infirm people who cannot normally get to church at all. It is assumed, of course, that the new fasting regulations have been observed. (J. and "Sacerdos".)

REPLY

Canon 867, §4: "Sacra communio iis tantum horis distribuitur, quibus Missae sacrificium offerri potest, nisi aliud rationabilis causa suadeat."

As is clear from the final clause of this canon, it was always lawful, even before *Christus Dominus*, to give Holy Communion in the afternoon or evening to those who had a reasonable cause for requesting the sacrament outside the normal hours (which according to the common law of canon 821, §1, extend from an hour before dawn to an hour after noon), provided they had observed the required fast. If the request was hardly ever made, that was doubtless because the complete fast from midnight then required was too formidable an obstacle. Nor was the obstacle really removed by *Christus Dominus*. It made certain relaxations in regard to liquid nourishment, but it restricted the concession of a three-hour fast from solid food to those who communicated during, or immediately before or after, an evening Mass,¹ so that all others, outside the danger of death, who wanted to communicate in the evening, however reasonable their cause, were required to fast from all solid food from the previous midnight, as before. *Sacram Communionem*, by requiring no more than a three-hour fast from solid food before any Communion, has substantially altered the situation. It would appear therefore that evening Communion is now not only lawful in theory, by virtue of canon 867, §4, for those who have a reasonable cause, but eminently practicable, and, in our opinion, priests need not hesitate to recommend it to such persons and make provision for meeting their legitimate requests.²

Cappello defines a reasonable cause as "quodcunque incommodum alicuius momenti, iter suscipiendum, maior com-

¹ Holy Office Instruction appended to *Christus Dominus*, n. 15.

² An unsigned commentary in *Monitor Ecclesiasticus*, 1957, LXXXII, f. II, p. 199, observes that this conclusion has already been drawn by several authors and can safely be followed.

moditas vel devotio, etc."¹; and, as Coronata adds,² it need not be grave. We consider therefore that it will normally be verified in the case of those who cannot conveniently come in the morning, and, *a fortiori*, in the case of aged and infirm persons whose condition, while not dangerous, prevents their coming to church. As Cappello further observes, the reasonable cause may be found either on the part of the communicant, or on that of the priest, who may well find it inconvenient to take Communion to these latter, as often as they and he would like, during the morning hours.

It is not easy to imagine anyone seeking to communicate in the evening, independently of evening Mass, with no reasonable cause for so doing; but, assuming that such requests may be made, the question arises as to whether they may be met. In other words, does *Sacram Communionem* permit all and sundry to communicate at any hour of the day, independently of Mass, provided only that they have observed a three-hour fast from solid food and alcoholic drink and a one-hour fast from non-alcoholic liquids other than water. The answer, in our opinion, must be in the negative. *Sacram Communionem* is silent on the point, but there is nothing in it which either explicitly or implicitly revokes the normal rule of canon 867, §4, that Holy Communion may be distributed only during the hours in which Mass can be offered. Now, it seems to us that the phrase "offerri potest" of that canon must be taken to refer to the hours in which Mass can be offered by the common law, and these still remain the hour before dawn to the hour after noon.³ It is true that local Ordinaries can now permit the celebration of Mass in the afternoon and evening of every day, "si bonum spirituale notabilis partis christifidelium id postulet", but Mass cannot be offered after 1 p.m. without this special permission and special reason, so that the afternoon hours are still not the normal hours of Mass, or, therefore, of Communion.

Moreover, according to Fr F. Hurth, S.J., of the Gregorian University, a number of theologians in Rome were authoritatively notified by the Holy Office, 13 April 1957, that "accord-

¹ *De Sacramentis*, I, n. 373. Similarly Regatillo, *Ius Sacramentarium*, m. 376.

² *De Sacramentis*, I, n. 337.

³ This is also the view of Mgr Oldani, in *Rivista del clero italiano*, May 1957, p. 256.

ing to the mind of the Holy Office, the distribution of afternoon Communion, independently of afternoon Mass, is prohibited by n. 15 of the Holy Office Instruction of 6 December 1953¹ (which is evidently regarded as not completely revoked by the new law); and we gather from the same author that this is the teaching of Cardinal Ottaviani, Secretary of the Holy Office, in a recent pamphlet.² Against such authority, private though it may be, it would be presumptuous to argue. But until the contrary is made clear, we shall interpret it as re-affirming the normal rule of canon 867, §4, not as revoking the final clause which admits exceptions from that rule, or as denying to them the benefit of the new fasting rules.

If therefore a priest announces that he is prepared to give Communion in the afternoon or evening, independently of Mass, he should make it clear that this provision is limited to those who have a reasonable cause for not communicating at the normal hours, or in connexion with an evening Mass. As regards the aged and infirm in their homes, any reason of convenience, either on his part or theirs, which is likely to increase the frequency of their Communions, can safely be considered sufficient.

L. L. McR.

ABSOLUTION FOR THE DEAD

If a bishop is present at a funeral, but does not celebrate the Requiem Mass, may he give the Absolution for the dead? (Inquirer.)

REPLY

It is the exclusive privilege of the Ordinary of the diocese to give the Absolution—should he desire to do so, he need not, but may leave it to the celebrant—after a Requiem Mass of which he was not the celebrant. And this he may do whether he had presided at the throne in cope and mitre or in *cappa*

¹ *Periodica*, XLVI, f. II, 15 June 1957, p. 227.

² *Il digiuno eucaristico*, published by *Studi cattolici*, June 1957, p. 7, n. 1.

magna; or assisted, in *mozzetta*,¹ among the clergy in choir; or even if he were not present at the Mass at all. This privilege of performing part of a function connected with Mass of which he is not the celebrant applies to a number of functions, e.g. the blessing of candles on Candlemas Day, the blessing of ashes on Ash Wednesday, of palms on Palm Sunday, the Rogations procession, the carrying of the Blessed Sacrament in the Corpus Christi procession, and is restricted by law² to the Ordinary of the diocese. He may not subdelegate even another bishop to so act. Especially does this rule apply to the Absolution for the dead, which—although it may be given apart from Mass³—is intimately connected with Mass, and (as modern liturgists teach) applies the fruits of the Mass to the dead. Indeed it is presumed that the whole funeral service (*Rituale Romanum*, VII, iii) has the same celebrant, and for the Absolution the rubric speaks expressly of the celebrant of the Mass.⁴ Neither the rubrics of the Ritual nor those of the Ceremonial of Bishops⁵ make any provision for a change of celebrants, and it is remarkable that at the fivefold Absolution given for dead persons of high rank it is the celebrating prelate who says the opening prayer and gives the final Absolution even though a prelate of higher rank is one of the *absolventes*.⁶ But decisions of *S.R.C.*⁷ do allow the Ordinary to give the Absolution when he is not the celebrant of the entire function and limit the privilege strictly to him. Thus a titular bishop, or a Protonotary Apostolic, is not allowed to give the Absolution *in casu*,⁸ and for the latter case the words of the *S.R.C.* are “quod jus uni reservatur Episcopo loci Ordinatio”. Earlier decisions of *S.R.C.* said only that it was becoming (*congruum*) that the celebrant of the Mass should give the Absolution, but these replies have been expunged from the collection of the decrees. That it is the exclusive privilege of the Ordinary to give the Absolution after a Mass at which he was not the celebrant is laid down by nearly all rubricians. It is, e.g. the teaching of Appeltern, De Amicis, De Herdt, Deodati-Toscano, Gatterer, Hébert, Nabuco, Stappen, Schober, Wuest-Mullaney-Barry, and of the *Ami du Clergé*.⁹ Only

¹ *S.R.C.*, 4355².

² *S.R.C.*, 1333¹², 2783².

³ *S.R.C.*, 3780⁸, 4183, 4270.

⁴ *R.R.*, VII, iii, 7.

⁵ *C.E.*, II, xi.

⁶ Cf. *Pontificale Romanum*.

⁷ *S.R.C.*, 3029¹⁰, 3798².

⁸ *S.R.C.*, 3798², 4154³⁰.

⁹ 1950, p. 608.

one *auctor probatus*, Vavasœur¹ extends the privilege to a cardinal anywhere, a Nuncio or Apostolic Delegate within the place of his jurisdiction, a Metropolitan in his province, and to a Vicar Apostolic in his vicariate. He cites for this view a very old issue of *Ephemerides Liturgicae* (vols. XI and XIII). He seems, therefore, to base the privilege on jurisdiction.² But modern liturgists³ give a much deeper reason for the privilege, it is that every priest who celebrates Mass is a concelebrant with those he names in the Canon, i.e. the Pope and the Ordinary of the diocese. "There exists between the diocesan bishop and the priests so close a unity that their liturgical acts remain his" (Honoré). A cardinal legate would, then, as representative of the Pope have the right to give the Absolution though not celebrant of the Mass that preceded it. Whether the privilege applies a cardinal not a legate is a moot point. Moretti,⁴ it would seem, thinks so; and Lesage expressly says so; but Nabuco in his recent very authoritative book *Jus Pontificalium*, and other writers, do not extend the privilege to a cardinal who is not a legate. A cardinal legate has all the privileges of a diocesan bishop in his territory.⁵

EMBER DAYS

(1) Is the new rubric of the Holy Week *Ordo* regarding *Flectamus genua* to be applied to other Masses, e.g. to the Ember Day Masses? (2) If the Ember Saturday Mass is commemorated only, which of the prayers is to be used for the commemoration? (Anxious.)

REPLY

(1) For *Flectamus genua* occurring in the Mass of the Ember Days of Advent, Lent and September the new rule is not to be

¹ *Fonctions Pontificales*, I, p. 266.

² If this were correct a titular bishop who is also a diocesan vicar-general would, it seems, have the privilege.

³ E.g. Philippeau in *Paroisse et Liturgie* 1951 (p. 188); Honoré in *Maison-Dieu*, 35 (p. 68); Lesage, *Dictionnaire Pratique de Liturgie Romaine* (p. 13).

⁴ II, p. 369.

⁵ Nabuco, p. 12.

applied until the Holy See so determines. This is the teaching of authoritative commentators¹ on the new Holy Week *Ordo* (e.g. Fr Bugnini in *Ephemerides Liturgicae*, 1956, p. 422). Accordingly, there will be on these days no pause after *Flectamus genua* for private prayer; the subdeacon at solemn Mass, the server at low Mass, will continue to reply *Levate* (*Ritus Celebrandi*, V, 4, 5) and not the deacon.

(2) When the Ember Day is commemorated only, the prayer for this is the first of the six prayers given in the Mass formulary. It is the prayer of the Office of the Day at Lauds.

J. B. O'C.

ROMAN DOCUMENTS

CARE OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT

SACRA CONGREGATIO RITUUM

DECRETUM

URBIS ET ORBIS (*A.A.S.*, 1957, XLIX, p. 425.)

Sanctissimam Eucharistiam maximo cum decore asservare sedula ac vigilanti cura semper studuit sancta Mater Ecclesia. Haec tamen sollicitudo diversimode per saecula in rem deducta est. Exinde percrebrescens in dies Eucharistica fidelium pietas, locum, ubi Dominicum asservatur Corpus, florentis christianae vitae centrum effecit.

Ad praecavendos vero abusus, et ut omnia secundum ordinem fierent, nonnulla documenta, decreta aut leges competens Auctoritas pluries emanavit, quibus locus, forma, usus Eucharistiae asservandae determinarentur. Quae omnia Codex Iuris Canonici ita colligit et exprimit: Can. 1268, §2: "Sanctissima Eucharistia custodiatur in praecellentissimo ac nobilissimo Ecclesiae loco, ac proinde regulariter in altari maiore." Can. 1269, §1: "Sanctissima Eucharistia servari debet in tabernaculo inamovibili in media parte altaris posito."

Novissime autem, Sanctissimus Dominus Noster Pius Pp. XII,

¹ It is now officially determined by a reply of S.R.C. to the Fathers of the Holy Ghost on 18 June 1956.

in sermone ad eos qui Congressui Internationali liturgiae pastoralis Assisii interfuerunt, die 22 Septembris an. 1956 habito,¹ potiora quaedam capita circa doctrinam et praxim Ecclesiae de reali praesentia Christi Domini in tabernaculo lucide exposuit, modernos quosdam errores reppulit, et pietatis exercitia erga Eucharisticum Sacramentum in tabernaculis asservatum, iuxta probatam Ecclesiae traditionem summopere commendavit.

His prae oculis habitis, Sacra haec Rituum Congregatio, vi facultatum sibi a Ss^{mo} D. N. Pio divina Providentia Papa XII tributarum, haec decrevit:

1. Normae a Codice Iuris Canonici circa Ss. Eucharistiam asservandam statutae (Cann. 1268, 1269) sancte religioseque servandae sunt; nec omittant locorum Ordinarii de hac re sedulo invigilare.

2. Tabernaculum adeo firmiter cum altari coniungatur, ut inamovibile fiat. Regulariter in altari maiore collocetur, nisi aliud venerationi et cultui tanti sacramenti commodius et decentius videatur, id quod ordinarie contingit in ecclesiis cathedralibus, collegiatis aut conventualibus, in quibus functiones chorales peragi solent; vel aliquando in maioribus sanctuariis, ne propter peculiarem fidelium devotionem erga obiectum veneratum, summus latriae cultus Ss^{mo} Sacramento debitus obnubiletur.

3. In altari ubi Ss^{ma} Eucharistia asservatur, habitualiter Sacrificium Missae celebrandum est.

4. In ecclesiis, ubi unicum exstat altare, hoc nequit ita aedificari, ut sacerdos celebret populum versus; sed super ipsum altare, in medio, poni debet tabernaculum ad asservandam Ss^{nam} Eucharistiam, ad normam legum liturgicarum constructum, forma et mensura tanto Sacramento omnino dignum.

5. Tabernaculum sit undequaque solide clausum, et adeo in omni sua parte securum, ut quodvis profanationis periculum arceatur.

6. Tabernaculum, tempore quo sacrae species in ipso asservantur, conopaeo sit coopertum ac, iuxta ecclesiae antiquam traditionem, lumen perenne ante ipsum ardeat.

7. Tabernaculum, quoad formam, stilo altaris et ecclesiae conveniat; ab illis in usu hucusque receptis haud nimis discrepet; non reducatur ad speciem simplicis capsae, sed verum habitaculum Dei cum hominibus quodammodo repraesentet; non ornatur symbolis vel figuris inusitatis, vel quae fidelium admirationem moveant, vel erronee interpretari possint, vel quae relationem ad Ss^{mum} Sacramentum non habeant.

8. Districte vetantur tabernacula eucharistica extra ipsum

¹ Cfr. A.A.S., Vol. XXXXVIII, pag. 711 ss.

altare posita, ex. gr. in pariete, aut ad latus, vel retro altare, aut in aediculis seu columnis ab altare separatis.

9. Contraria consuetudo, sive quoad modum Eucharistiam asservandi, sive quoad formam tabernaculi, praesumi nequit, nisi agatur de consuetudine centenaria vel immemorabili (cf. Can. 62, §2), uti ex. gr. in casu quorundam tabernaculorum ad modum turris vel aediculae aedificatorum. Hae tamen formae reproduci nequeunt.

Contrariis quibuslibet minime obstantibus.

Romae, 1 Iunii 1957.

C. Card. CICOGNANI, *Praefectus*

† A. Carinci, Archiep. Seleuc., *a Secretis*

THE LAW OF THE ORIENTAL CHURCH

With the promulgation of a *Motu Proprio*, "Cleri sanctitati", to which the whole of *A.A.S.*, volume XLIX, n. 9, is devoted, the codification of the law of the Oriental Church has been carried an important stage further towards its completion. The document comprises five *tituli*, namely, *De ritibus orientalibus*, *De personis physicis et moralibus*, *De clericis in genere*, *De clericis in specie*, and *De Laicis*. Since the law affecting Religious had already been promulgated in the *Motu Proprio*, *Postquam Apostolicis Litteris*, of 9 February 1952, the section *De personis* is thus completed.

BOOK REVIEWS

Anscar Vonier, Abbot of Buckfast. By Dom Ernest Graf. Pp. x + 154. Seven illustrations. (Burns Oates. 13s. 6d.)

THIS memoir of an outstanding Churchman has long been overdue. Dom Ernest was an obvious choice as biographer, long years of intimacy having given him a unique opportunity of knowing his subject thoroughly. It is perforce mainly a life of external activity that he records. The Abbot's inner personal life was his own secret. He was by nature reticent; he kept no spiritual notes or diary; and, apart from what may be divined from his published writings, the

only extant documents that are in any way revealing are the letters he wrote to the Benedictine Abbess of Dourgne in France.

Martin Vonier was born of a devout German Catholic family in 1876. After some early training in France where he acquired a remarkable fluency in the language and the seeds of a lifelong devotion to French Catholic writers, especially Bossuet, he came to Buckfast as an alumnus in 1889 and entered the noviciate four years later. He took his final vows in 1894 and was ordained priest in 1898. He then spent a year in Rome at Sant' Anselmo and gained his doctor's degree. The first Abbot of Buckfast perished in the wreck of the *Siro* in 1906; Dom Anscar who accompanied him was saved and was chosen to succeed him. The young Abbot (he was barely thirty) at once set himself to the task of rebuilding the Abbey church on its ancient mediaeval foundations; the monks themselves were to be the builders. The work took thirty years and the Abbot lived just long enough to see its final phase, the great central tower, completed. In spite of his fine presence Abbot Vonier was never robust. For some years before his death his health was definitely failing, but the end came unexpectedly on 26 December 1938.

The glorious Abbey church with its splendid furnishings is Abbot Vonier's most spectacular monument. Only a man of great faith, courage and tenacity could have achieved it. But no less, even indeed more important was his unobtrusive but highly successful work within his community. The work had its anxious problems. There was the problem of possible dissolution created by the First World War when the community were classed as enemy aliens. There was the different but no less serious problem of the internal regime. The original Buckfast community had come from La Pierre-qui-Vire in France and had brought with them a discipline that was partly Benedictine, partly missionary and largely Trappist. Vonier had felt the strain of this regime; it affected his health. And he saw how it tended to destroy the community by discouraging promising candidates. At the same time he had retained an appreciation of the more liberal but full Benedictine spirit which he had experienced at Sant' Anselmo. It was his chief work as Abbot to introduce this spirit into Buckfast. At his death he left a large and flourishing community affiliated to the English Province of the Cassinese Congregation.

Add to all this the Abbot's noted theological writings and his distinction as a preacher and you have the picture of a man of many gifts, "a great Benedictine", as the Abbot of Prinknash said in his funeral oration, "great in every sense of the word; great in his body, and in his mind, and in his heart—an outstanding personality".

Dom Ernest's aim has been to depict the Abbot as he really was

to those who knew him best, "warts and all". But a man's greatness is not lessened but rather enhanced by being drawn in true perspective. This is a delightful biography, pleasant to read and full of interest.

St Bernadette. A Pictorial Biography. By Leonard von Matt and Francis Trochu. Translated from the French by Herbert Rees. 183 plates. Medium 8vo. Pp. xii + 91. (Longmans. 30s.)

LEONARD VON MATT of Buochs, Switzerland, has already published pictorial biographies of St Francis of Assisi, St Pius X, and St Ignatius of Loyola, which competent critics have hailed as masterpieces of photographic art. His fourth venture in this new and very effective form of biography is as brilliant as its predecessors. The 183 plates, most of them full-page, are superb. With exquisite skill the artist brings to life the persons and scenes of Lourdes past and present and of Nevers. The text is at one with the pictures; it is by a foremost authority on St Bernadette, Mgr Trochu.

The Bishop of Tarbes and Lourdes contributes a Foreword on Mary's abiding presence at Lourdes. She smiled on Bernadette, and she continues to comfort with her smile sinners, the sick, and indeed all mankind. Lourdes is the home of all who can call her their Mother; through her presence it is the capital of Christian peace and, next to Rome, pre-eminently the Catholic City.

This is, then, not just another book on Lourdes. It stands alone in its power to impress the history and meaning of the City on the mind of the reader.

Saint Bernard of Clairvaux. By Bruno S. James. Pp. 192. (Hodder & Stoughton. 12s. 6d.)

"PARVUM opus, magnus labor", says the author, adapting a phrase of Seneca. St Bernard is indeed a difficult subject to keep within the limits of a short biography. He was so much involved in the stirring events of his time that a vast amount of material is available about him. But much of this material is historical rather than strictly biographical, and there arises the problem of pruning and balancing so as not to lose the man himself in his external activities. Fr James has made a nice adjustment. He has sketched enough of the historical background to set the Saint's life in its proper context; against this background he has drawn a lifelike portrait of the man, dedicated in mind, soul and strength to God and His Church, but contending all the while with ill-health, moods of depression and irritation, and a natural indignation with bureaucratic small-mindedness even in the highest ecclesiastical circles. Fr James has

given thirty years to the study of St Bernard. He has perused all the available sources, and he acknowledges his full indebtedness to the standard lives by Vacandard, Watkin Williams and the Trappist Historical Commission. A few years ago he published a translation of St Bernard's Letters. Letters depict the true character of a man as no other of his writings do. Fr James has enhanced the value and accuracy of his biography by making fairly extensive use of the Saint's letters.

It would have been well if Fr James had given us more on St Bernard's mysticism. After all, mystical prayer was the central, co-ordinating fact of his life and the mainspring of his superhuman activity; and he takes rank among the great exponents of mystical theology, with an originality of approach that had a profound effect on the piety of the whole of the Middle Ages. While he contemplated the Word, he contemplated too the Word incarnate and His Mother; he was unsurpassed even by St Francis of Assisi in his tender devotion to Christ in the Manger and on the Cross. This genuine piety of the heart quickened his writings; as St Gertrude said, his eloquence was persuasive and penetrating like honey.

With St Bernard the patristic age closed. The scholastic age had already begun with St Anselm. In that great movement of theological and philosophical thought St Bernard cannot be granted any effective part. It is by his work for the revival of the power of the Papacy against the encroachments of civil authority and by his practical, devotional spiritual teaching that he dominates the Middle Ages. But the Middle Ages had not yet reached their zenith when St Bernard died. Innocent III, St Dominic and St Francis, St Thomas and the great scholastics were still to come; the thirteenth, not the twelfth, is the greatest of the mediaeval centuries. One cannot, then, accept Fr James's dictum that with St Bernard's death the Middle Ages went into a slow decline.

But it will always be possible to find details to criticize in a work of such difficulty as a biography of St Bernard. Such details do not really detract from the merits of Fr James's book. He need not be so modest as to call it merely an essay in biography. It gives a genuine picture of the Saint; it is a balanced account; and it is inspiring to read.

J. C.

L'Univers Leibnizien. By Joseph Moreau. Pp. 247. (Paris: Emmanuel Vitte.)

To produce a new work on Leibniz calls for a measure of courage, perhaps less so in French or English than would be the case in

German, in which most of the standard volumes have been written. Professor Joseph Moreau of the university of Bordeaux contributes such a book to the series, *Problèmes et Doctrines*, published by Emmanuel Vitte. It is a clear and helpful summary of Leibniz's thought, but studied from a particular point of view. The philosopher's purpose, Professor Moreau suggests, was not so much to seek for as to defend truth. Certainly, Leibniz was far better acquainted with Scholastic thinking than was Spinoza or probably Descartes and, a man of wide Christian interests, he had a considerable sympathy with, if no profound knowledge of, Catholicism.

He began with an even more comprehensive ideal of human knowledge than Descartes, witness his *Ars Combinatoria* or general algebra of logic and his later conception of an Encyclopaedia of universal knowledge. In fact, Leibniz was one of the most learned and gifted men of the late seventeenth century. But, although he criticized the mechanism of the Cartesians, he accepted their main contention that all action in the universe can be explained in mechanist terms. Where he differed from them was in demanding an active, dynamic element in Nature which they had ignored. This was due in part to his introduction to physics through Hobbes and Gassendi which led him to embrace an atomic theory. For the time being he rejected the Aristotelian notion of substantial forms and in an early letter to Thomasius he speaks of Nature as God's clock-work. He soon, however, reached the conclusion that movement in the universe was impossible without a spiritual factor. This spirit can occupy no other space than a point, and he describes this position, in correspondence with the Duke of Braunschweig-Luneburg—the mixture of Latin and German is peculiarly his own—as follows: also ist *mens* eine kleine in einem Punct begriffene Welt, so aus denen *ideis* wie *centrum ex angulis* bestehet (Latin words *underlined* and the passage meaning that "mind is a little world concentrated in a point, constituted by ideas as a centre is constituted by angles"). This is soon developed into a system of immanent dynamism, in which all bodies possess an interior principle, substantial and incorporeal. The substantial forms of Aristotle have for all practical purposes returned, though Leibniz, unlike Aristotle, did not think of them as efficient causes. This position was reached by Leibniz in his earlier writings but it is substantially his later doctrine of monads.

One can, however, observe an advance in Leibniz's interpretation of God's relation to the universe. To begin with, he insisted that physical phenomena are to be explained physically and no recourse must be had to God for the explanation of particular events. These are to be referred to their proximate causes. God is only the general

reason for the universe as a whole. Nature, to employ his expression, is God's clockwork and the laws by which that clockwork is controlled are independent of God. Later he adopts a very different standpoint. The laws of Nature are now seen to exist for the provision and permanence of the universe as this reflects the divine wisdom. All natural phenomena, he writes, can be mechanically explained, if we take them on the physical level, but the principles of mechanics cannot be explained geometrically because they depend upon higher principles which characterize the wisdom of their Author in the order and perfection of His work. Leibniz has an ingenious theory of creation. He distinguishes his position clearly from that of Spinoza by rejecting any absolute necessity for the world; he speaks instead of a *moral* necessity that does not exclude metaphysical contingency in creatures. God creates freely but in accordance with His wisdom and goodness and therefore the existing universe is the best possible. *Potest omnia, vult optima*—this is how Leibniz claims to safeguard God's liberty. Yet even here, he assures us, God is acting as a geometrician and creating according to the law of maximum perfection. "I begin as a philosopher," Leibniz wrote, "but I finish as a theologian. One of my great principles is that nothing happens without reason. That is a principle of philosophy. None the less, in the last resort, it is nothing more than an acceptance of divine wisdom."

Professor Moreau is careful to compare and contrast Leibniz and, to one side, Descartes and, to the other, Spinoza, and his comparisons are sound and balanced. With some reason, he considers that Leibniz's doctrine of monads and pre-established harmony is a re-statement on a grander scale of the occasionalism of Malebranche. It certainly is open to the charge that it does away with all secondary causality, since there is no action or reaction on the physical plane but only mutual correspondence within this harmony.

Théorie de l'Assentiment. By Antonio Rosmini. Translated and edited, with an introduction, by Marie-Louise Roure. Pp. 210. (Emmanuel Vitte, Paris.)

ROSMINI's thought is little known in this country and Rosmini himself appears occasionally in Scholastic manuals among the ranks of *adversarii*. A second volume of the series, *Problèmes et Doctrines*, presents a French version of part of his *Logica*, a work composed towards the close of his life, in 1850 and 1851. The translation is preceded by a lengthy introduction, which is a study of his doctrine of knowledge, by Mlle Roure who lectures on philosophy at the Catholic university of Lyons.

It was Rosmini's contention that logic and epistemology needed to be reviewed in the light of German critical thought. He was familiar with the works both of Kant and Hegel, and Gentile, the Italian neo-Hegelian, who had a high regard for Rosmini's philosophical writings, spoke of him as the Italian Kant and soundly berated him for not advancing to a system of actual Idealism. He has been charged with subjectivism on account of his statement that the presence of mind is necessary for being and is even a constituent of being, since otherwise being cannot be known. But in his analysis of Kantian doctrine, Rosmini condemns it precisely because it restricts human knowledge to phenomena and claims that intuition can have no real object. The intuition of being which he posits as the basis of his theory of knowledge belongs to the order of the *a priori*—that is, it is prior to any actual experience in that it expresses itself in all experience—but it is not a synthetic *a priori* form of the Kantian type. On the contrary, it might be argued that Rosmini is almost too *objective*, so objective in fact that there is no problem of knowledge left, since we are put into immediate contact with being and reality through this primal intuition. And so knowledge is a synthesis of experience, that is sensation, and this intuition of being in general, which is thus the form of our understanding. This original intuition gives us being, pure, ideal, undetermined. All other ideas are determinations of this, so that this intuition is at once source and guarantee of knowledge.

Rosmini's logic, of which the theory of assent is the most characteristic part, is less formal than the ordinary Scholastic logic. He does not reject formal logic, though he criticizes Aristotelian logic as too exclusively formal and as missing the movement of man's mind towards reality. Knowledge is something wider than logic which, left to itself, is concerned only with the mechanics of thinking and may therefore be wholly abstracted from the reality which gives it sense. Man, he argues, is a reasoning animal, and habit and experience develop this natural tendency. The mind reflecting on this process produces a science of correct reasoning, which is scientific logic. But for Rosmini logic stands in the light of the primary intuition of being which is its first principle. If reason is the faculty by which man applies the idea of being to things perceived, then it is the office of logic to determine the proper conditions of the use of reason. He was also attracted by certain aspects of the Hegelian logic, which led him to accept the ontological argument for God's existence. Like Descartes, he would say that we cannot speak of the finite without the infinite. The perception of the finite is virtual; it gives us the finite not *qua* finite or even *qua* contingent but *qua*

being. By reflexion the mind discovers that it is finite and contingent, but this note of contingent contains its correlative, the necessary, as finite includes the infinite.

The theory of assent which occupies the second part of this volume is Scholastic in form, with articles, scholia and corollaries. What is the ground of our assent to propositions? The basis of knowledge is sufficiently clear; it is the synthesis of sensation and the intuition of being. In itself, this synthesis is infallible. But it is not mind that judges but man. A possible judgement becomes an actual judgement through will. Judgement is not an act of the will but an act dictated by the will, even though this voluntary element is spontaneous when the possible judgement is crystal clear. Error arises in part from instinctive reaction or sentiment but also from reflexion, which does not consider—and sometimes has no wish to consider—all the liens between subject and predicate. What Rosmini terms “superior reflexion”—that is interests and *parti pris*—is in a particular way responsible for error. The root cause, however, is man’s “eudaimonological tendency”. Man has three basic tendencies: towards truth, moral good and “eudaimonological” happiness. Where the third of these tendencies is subordinated to the first and second, you have truth and goodness; otherwise, there will be error. Mdlle Roure has done a good service in editing and commenting on Rosmini’s logic, for his work, as I have said, is little known and deserves wider appreciation.

J. M.

The Sisters are Asking. By Winfrid Herbst, S.D.S. Pp. 190. (Newman Press, Westminster, Maryland, U.S.A. \$3.00.)

PREACHING retreats to religious Sisters is a source of much consolation to the retreat master, who—if in this he resembles the present writer—as a result of his convent experiences cultivates an increasing admiration for the communities of women who have vowed themselves to God. Our convents exhibit a high standard of observance: no section of the Church can be more pleasing to its Founder. In fact one has heard our nuns referred to as “the ten just men” who screen the world from the divine judgements.

Fr Herbst has preached to hundreds of American communities, making it a practice to have a question-box in order to give the Sisters in general the benefit derived from the explanation of particular difficulties. He now publishes a volume of these questions and their answers, which will certainly make useful reading for English-speaking religious in any part of the world. An extensive range of doctrine is covered. Most of the questioners were obviously novices

and nuns in early profession, all eager to advance in the spiritual life. Some points raised, for instance "What is the difference between the vow and virtue of poverty?" emphasize the necessity for sound instruction, during a retreat and at other times as well. Conferences and devotional meditations have their essential places in planning the spiritual exercises, but more important than either is the direct inculcation of doctrinal truth. This book is produced primarily for religious Sisters, but it will benefit also those whose duty and privilege it is to address them.

The Externals of the Catholic Church. By John F. Sullivan. Pp. xxi + 404. (Longmans. 6s. 9d.)

LITTLE did Mgr Sullivan think when launching his handbook of Catholic usage and liturgy in 1917 that, forty years on, it would be maintaining the place it immediately won upon being first published, as a standard source of information and reference. In writing his book the author had accumulated a mass of material which he cleverly shaped into a layman's manual. This newly revised and rearranged edition (it contains the reformed liturgy of Holy Week) is intended primarily for school use by senior boys and girls, who will find it a fully informative means of understanding the visible features of their religion.

Everything seen and heard in the practice of the Faith is here spoken of, special attention being given to the Mass and the Sacraments and whatever is connected with them. The Church itself and its government are explained, as are the liturgical year, various devotions and sacramentals. Several pages of excellent line illustrations—easily reproducible by teachers on the blackboard and by pupils in their books—at once convey ready understanding of unfamiliar words and articles, giving the work a most satisfying quality of completeness. It is a Catholic Dictionary without the pages concerning heretical doctrine and erroneous opinions, but giving full explanations of all that is external in our religious practice.

L. T. H.

CORRESPONDENCE

ECCLESIASTICAL LATIN

Christopher Batley writes:

The frank and humble letter of Canon Burrett in the *CLERGY REVIEW* for September has surely touched a far bigger question than the New Psalter—it is the question of the Latin language itself.

Is Latin a language only of the past or does it still live? Is it a tiresome archaism that priests must master and everybody else leave alone?

I had every opportunity of learning to emulate Cicero at Rugby School and if I have achieved only a low standard of Church Latin it is entirely my fault, though there was little incentive. As soon as I became a Catholic at once there was a *terminus ad quem*, and I too found I could get along fairly well with the Epistle and Gospels and rubrics of the Mass. Week by week I studied the Missal and Latin became alive; I was interested.

Surely here is a wonderful way to fire the zeal of young Catholics. I am sure those who have to struggle with Ovid, Livy, Virgil, etc., earlier in the week would find themselves carried enthusiastically along if they started to "con" the Sunday Mass; especially when they found some of the "howlers" which they had been taught were not allowed.

Is not this something apostolic for Catholic schools? Could we not thus make Latin a living language for the educated laity and encourage an intelligent participation in Holy Mass?

Sacram Communionem

(THE CLERGY REVIEW, October 1957, p. 589)

Dom Peter Flood writes:

I do not wish to intrude upon the discussion between Dr McReavy and Dr O'Kelly, if only because the latter does not radically differ from the former, except when he challenges a well-established norm of interpretation; but I would like to comment, in full agreement with Dr McReavy, on Dr O'Kelly's approval of the action of the priest whom he quotes as allowing a pregnant woman to take "a small amount of solid food" before Communion, her doctor having prescribed a biscuit or its equivalent.

This is surely to introduce a new category of food, *cibum per modum medicinae*, that is without any previous warranty in its application to the Eucharistic fast. Nor does Dr O'Kelly cite any authority for it. There must be a distinction between "true and proper medicine" and food, whether in a liquid or a solid form. It is true that there are conditions or states of life in which fasting beyond short periods of time produces undesirable effects, which are naturally relieved by the intake of food in one form or the other. This has already been fully recognized in the existing legislation by the reduced periods of fasting required in the case of the sick, infirm and aged. These may take non-alcoholic liquid food as a drink without limit of time. Since this may be milk, milk with a raw egg beaten up in it, thin gruel, arrowroot, etc., in fact anything, so long as it remains in common estimation to be taken as a drink, it seems that it may be fairly said that such cases as that quoted, are amply provided for in the law of the Church. I may, perhaps, add that in the case of diabetics under treatment with Insulin, the doctor will often prescribe the taking of glucose upon the onset of certain symptoms. There is no reason why this should not be taken dissolved in water or other non-alcoholic liquid. Thus the medical need and the requirement of the fasting law will both be satisfied.

PASTORAL VISITING

(THE CLERGY REVIEW, September 1957, p. 527)

The Rev. J. Foster writes:

Fr Ripley's article on "the sacrament of the door-knocker" might well be a spur to increased activity, but it will as effectively curb, what Mgr Philip Hughes regards as more important and relevant, the contemplative attitude to modern pastoral problems. There is a hierarchy in the cardinal virtues and English Catholics, understandably, habitually give to fortitude the primacy which rightly belongs to prudence. The past century has been one in which the Church in this country has been stampeded into adopting all manner of artificial devices to preserve what she has: the danger is that we accept these as the norm of genuine Catholic action. The school, for example, has come to take the place of the community as the main educational influence. Similarly, parish visiting is given a primacy which by right belongs to every baptized member of the local community. Anyone who has read *The Uses of Literacy* will realize that making the Church in the world today demands

methods which have been better thought out than those of a century ago.

The parish exists, I take it, to bring the life of God, immediately to every individual person within its territorial boundaries, remotely to the whole world. The methods taken to achieve this are imposed on the parish by the actual situation in which it finds itself. As a supernatural entity, it co-operates with what it finds already existing in the order of the natural: local loyalties, traditions, grouping, and affiliations. Parish visiting, in the form adopted a century ago, tends to raise still higher both the barrier existing between the Catholic and the non-Catholic and that between priest and people by isolating the Catholic from the natural sphere of his apostolate, the actual situation in which he lives and works, and by consolidating the "kept" status of the laity.

What we advocate is not dispensing with parish visiting but raising its sights. The parish will never become a genuine (i.e. missionary) unit of the Church unless we are prepared to use such visiting as a means to form authentic Catholic groupings in every street or block of flats, which themselves become responsible for making the Church and animating the local community in these areas.

BAPTISMAL LEAFLET

(THE CLERGY REVIEW, October 1957, p. 640)

Fr Davis writes:

In his very kind review of the baptismal leaflet Fr Howell expressed the opinion that the front illustration would prove unattractive. This judgement has been shown to have been only too correct. I would like on behalf of the promoters of the leaflet to inform your readers that this illustration has been removed and a Chi-Rho symbol printed in red substituted for it. Otherwise the leaflet remains the same, and we hope it will prove useful to the clergy.

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM

ury
N
ely
ely
sed
s a
ist-
ng,
go,
the
ple
ate,
ing
but
(i.e.
uch
very
for
hese

well
un-
too
et to
nd a
the
the

d for
r, in